BAPTISM
AND THE
Lord's Supper:
Substantially Asserted:
BEING AN
APOLOGY
In Behalf of the People called
QUAKERS,
Concerning those *Two Heads*:

By *ROBERT BARCLAY.*

LONDON,
Printed, and Sold by *T. Sowle*, in *White-Hart-Court* in *Gracious-Street.* 1696.

UMI

TO THE READER.

Friendly Reader,

HAving often obſerved, upon ſerious Diſcourſe with divers Perſons, concerning our Principles, their having received general ſatisfaction, excepting in theſe Two Heads, *viz. Baptiſm* and the *Lord's Supper*, and not knowing but that thou may be at a ſtand concerning the ſame, I do here

preſent thee for thy further information and ſatisfaction theſe following Sheets, written and publiſhed ſeveral Years ago, upon the ſame Subjects, by my Father *Robert Barclay*, in his *Apology* Dedicated to King *Charles* the Second.

The ſecond and more particular reaſon of their being thus publiſhed by themſelves, is, that being Bound up in a pretty large Book, they may not be of ſuch general Service, in regard that ſome diſſatisfied only concerning theſe Two Points, may not much care to Buy the whole. Be-

Being fully ſatisfied his aim in Penning them, was for thy ſatisfaction, I ſhall commend them no otherways, than by recommending them to thy ſerious peruſal, not doubting if they be by thee received in the ſame *Spirit* of *Love*, they were for thy ſake deſigned, they may prove advantageous.

I do likewiſe adviſe thee ſeriouſly to conſider, what woful conſequence have been procured in the *Titular Chriſtian World*, ſince the firſt Apoſtacy after the Apoſtles Days, about theſe things, and

and the ſetting up of Forms and Ceremonies in the *Church* in Matters purely *Religious*, and relying thereupon, as there are too many in theſe Days do, who by graſping at the ſhadow do loſe the ſubſtance. I pray God open the Eyes, and enlighten the Underſtandings of ſuch, that ſeeing the emptineſs and inſufficiency, as well as folly thereof, they may with their whole *Hearts* and *Souls* lay hold upon him who is able to ſave, and that to the *uttermoſt*.

To the Reader.

I would have none offended that I call thoſe Ceremomonies, which they may think Eſſential Duties, without their being firſt aſſured they are ſuch.

Although I refer thee to the following Sheets for thy more particular Information, yet it may not ſeem impertinent to put thee in mind of that ſaying of *John* the *Baptiſt* concerning himſelf, *I indeed baptize you with Water unto Repentance, but he that cometh after me, is mightier than I, he ſhall baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt, and with*

Fire, *Mat.* 3. 11. alſo *HE muſt Increaſe but* I *muſt Decreaſe*, *John* 3. 30. likewiſe that of *Paul* to the *Epheſians*, where he notably argues, as there is but *one Lord*, *one Faith*, ſo there is but *one Baptiſm*, *Eph.* 4. 5. which the Apoſtle *Peter* poſitively aſſerts *is not the waſhing away of the filth of the fleſh, but the anſwer of a good Conſcience towards God*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. Theſe I leave without Commentary, to thy impartial peruſal.

It were greatly to be wiſhed for, that we who covet to be called by that Honourable Name

Name of *Chriſtian*, were more inward, leſs in ſhow, more in *Subſtance*, that our *Chriſtianity* were more in our *Hearts*, and leſs in our Heads; then would our *Religion* be pure and undefiled, carrying along with it that Characteriſtick mark, of *viſiting* the *Widow* and the *Fatherleſs*, and keeping our ſelves *unſpotted* from the World; this is the Deſcription the *Apoſtle James* in his Day gave of True *Religion*, *James* 1. 27. this is likewiſe the Path the True *Chriſtian* ought now to walk in, it being only as we here abide

abide, that we can ſtand approved, in the ſight of our Great *Creator*, in which, Reader, as thou art found a Walker, with a ſingle Heart and Eye unto God, thou wilt know an eating of the *Fleſh*, and drinking of the *Blood* of the Son of God, by which thou vvilt knovv *Life*, unto thy *Soul*, according to that ſaying of our *Lord* and *Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*, *Except ye eat the Fleſh, and drink the Blood of the Son of Man, there is no Life in you*; for ſaith he, *my Fleſh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed*,

John

John 6. 53. 55. This Food is Inward, it is Spiritual, to the Nouriſhment of the inner Man, not perceptible to the outvvard Notions of Carnal-minded Men; this is the true *Supper* of vvhich the Saints do *feed*, vvhereby they are *refreſhed*, to the comforting of their Immortal Souls, being the ſame vvhich the Saints in all Ages vvere partakers of: Which that thou may come to knovv, and be made partaker of, by Waiting for, and being Obedient unto the Appearance of his *Grace*, *Light*, *Spirit*, or *Word* of Life in thy own

ovvn Soul, (that being the only Way) is the Desire of thy Sincere Friend,

Robert Barclay.

London, *the* 12*th.* *of the* 8*th. Month,* 1695.

CON-

CONCERNING
BAPTISM.

As there is one Lord, *and* one Faith, *so there is* one Baptiſm; which is not the putting away the *filth* of the *fleſh*, but the *Anſwer* of a good Conſcience before God, by the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt. *And this* Baptiſm *is a* Pure *and* Spiritual *thing, to wit, the* Baptiſm of the Spirit *and* Fire, *by which we are buried with him; that being waſhed and purged from our* Sins, *we may* walk in newneſs of Life: *Of which the* Baptiſm *of* John *was a Figure, which was Commanded for a time, and not to continue for ever. As to the* Baptiſm *of* Infants, *it is a meer* Humane Tradition, *for which neither* Precept *nor* Practice *is to be found in all the Scripture.*

Eph. 4. 5. 1 Pet. 3. 21. Rom. 6. 4. Gal. 3. 27. Col. 2. 12. John 3. 30. 1 Cor. 1. 17.

WHen *God* in *Condeſcenſion* to his choſen people, the *Jews*, did preſcribe to them by his Servant *Moſes* many

From whence *Idolatries* and *Heathen-Superſtitions* did ſpring.

many *Ceremonies* and *Obſervations*, as *Types* and *Shadows* of the *Subſtance*, which in due time was to be *Revealed*; which conſiſted for the moſt part in *Waſhings*, outward *Purifications* and *Cleanſings*, which were to continue, until the Time of the *Reformation*, until the *Spiritual Worſhip* ſhould be ſet up, and that God by the more powerful *pouring forth* of his *Spirit*, and guiding of that *Anointing*, ſhould *lead* his Children *into all Truth*, and teach them to *Worſhip* him in a way more *Spiritual* and acceptable to him, though leſs agreeable to the *Carnal* and *Outward Senſes*. Yet notwithſtanding *God's Condeſcenſion* to the *Jews* in ſuch things, we ſee, that that part in man, which delights to follow its own *Inventions*, could not be reſtrained, nor yet ſatisfied with all theſe *Obſervations*; but that often-times they would be either *declining* to the other *Superſtitions* of the *Gentiles*, or *adding* ſome *New Obſervations* and *Ceremonies* of their own: To which they were ſo devoted, that they were ſtill apt to *prefer them* before the *Command* of *God*, and that under the Notion of *Zeal* and *Piety*. This we ſee abundantly in the Example of the *Phariſees*, the *Chiefeſt Sect* among the *Jews*, whom Chriſt ſo frequently reproves for

The *Phariſees* the *Chiefeſt Sect* among the *Jews*.

making

making void the Commandments of God by their Traditions, Matth. 15. 6, 9, *&c.* This *Complaint* may at this day be no leſs juſtly made, as to many bearing the *Name* of *Chriſtians*, who have introduced many things of this kind, partly *borrowed* from the *Jews*, which they more tenaciouſly ſtick to, and more earneſtly contend for, than for the *weightier Points* of *Chriſtianity*; becauſe that *Self* yet alive and ruling in them, loves their own *Inventions* better, than *God's Commands*. But if they can by any means ſtretch any *Scripture-practice*, or *Conditional precept* or *permiſſion*, fitted to the *Weakneſs* or *Capacity* of ſome, or appropriate to ſome *particular Diſpenſation*, to give ſome *Colour* for any of theſe their *Inventions*, they do then ſo tenaciouſly ſtick to them, and ſo obſtinately and obſtreperouſly plead for them, that they will not patiently hear the *moſt-ſolid Chriſtian Reaſons* againſt them. Which *Zeal*, if they would but ſeriouſly Examine it, they would find to be but the *prejudice* of *Education*, and the *Love* of *Self*, more than of *God*, or his *Pure Worſhip*. This is verified concerning thoſe things, which are called *Sacraments*; about which they are very ignorant in *Religious Controverſies*, who underſtand not, how much *Debate*,

Many things in *Chriſtendom* are borrow'd from the *Jews* and *Gentiles*.

Of *Sacraments* ſo many *Controverſies*.

bate, Contention, Jangling and *Quarrelling* there has been among thoſe called *Chriſtians:* So that I may ſafely ſay, the *Controverſie* about them, to wit, about their *Number, Nature, Vertue, Efficacy, Adminiſtration* and other things, hath been more than about any other *Doctrine* of *Chriſt*, whether as betwixt *Papiſts* and *Proteſtants*, or among *Proteſtants* betwixt *themſelves*. And how great *prejudice* theſe *Controverſies* have brought to Chriſtians, is very obvious; whereas the things contended for among them, are for the moſt part but *Empty Shadows*, and meer *Out-ſide* things: as I hope hereafter to make appear to the patient and unprejudicate *Reader*.

The Name of *Sacrament* (not found in *Scripture*) is *borrow'd* from the *Heathens*.

§ II. That which comes firſt under Obſervation, is the Name [*Sacrament*] which is ſtrange, that *Chriſtians* ſhould ſtick to, and *Contend* ſo much for, ſince it is not to be found in all the *Scripture*; but was borrowed from the *Military Oaths* among the *Heathens*, from whom the *Chriſtians*, when they began to *Apoſtatize*, did *borrow* many *ſuperſtitious Terms* and *Obſervations*, that they might thereby *Ingratiate* themſelves, and the more eaſily gain the *Heathens* to their *Religion:* which *practice*, though perhaps intended by them for *good*, yet, as being the fruit of *Humane Policy*;

licy, and not according to *God's Wisdom*, has had very *pernicious Consequences*. I see not, how any, whether *Papists* or *Protestants*, especially the latter, can in reason quarrel with us for denying this *Term*, which it seems the *Spirit* of *God* saw not meet to inspire the *Pen-men* of the *Scriptures* to leave unto us.

But if it be said, That *it is not the Name, but the Thing, they contend for*: Obj. 1.

I *Answer*: Let the *Name* then, as not being *Scriptural*, be laid aside, and we shall see at first Entrance, how much *Benefit* will redound by laying aside this *Traditional Term*, and betaking us to *plainness* of *Scripture-Language*. For presently the great *Contest* about the *Number* of them will evanish; seeing there is no Term used in Scripture, that can be made use of, whether we call them *Institutions*, *Ordinances*, *Precepts*, *Commandments*, *Appointments* or *Laws*, &c. that would afford ground for such a *Debate*; since neither *Papists* will affirm, that there are only *Seven*, or *Protestants* only *Two*, of any of these forementioned. *Answ:*

If it be said, That this *Controversie arises from the Definition of the* Thing, *as well as from the* Name; Obj. 2.

It will be found otherwise: For what- *Answ:*

The *Definition* of *Sacraments* agrees to many other things.

ever way we take their *Definition* of a *Sacrament*, whether as an *outward, visible Sign, whereby inward Grace is conferred, or only signified*: This *Definition* will agree to many things, which neither *Papists* nor *Protestants* will acknowledge to be *Sacraments*. If they be expressed under the Name of *Sealing Ordinances*, as some do, I could never see, neither by *Reason* nor *Scripture*, how this *Title* could be appropriate to them, more than to any other *Christian, Religious Performance*: for that must needs properly be a *Sealing Ordinance*, which makes the *Persons* receiving it *infallibly certain* of the *Promise*, or *Thing sealed* to them.

What *Sealing Ordinance* doth mean?

Obj. 3. If it be said, *It is so to them, that are faithful.*

Answ. I *Answer*: So is *Praying* and *Preaching*, and doing of every *good Work*: Seeing the *Partaking* or *Performing* of the *one* gives not to any a *more certain Title to Heaven*, yea (in some respect) not so much; there is no *Reason* to call them so, more than the other.

Besides, we find not any thing called the *Seal* and *Pledge* of our *Inheritance*, but the *Spirit* of *God*; it is by that we are said to be *sealed*, Eph. 1. 14. & 4. 30. which is also termed the *Earnest of our Inheritance*,

tance, 2 Cor. 1. 22. and not by *outward Water*, or *Eating* and *Drinking*; which as the *Wickedest* of Men may partake of, so many that do, do notwithstanding it, go to *Perdition*. For it is not *outward Washing with Water*, that maketh the *Heart clean*, by which Men are fitted for *Heaven*: And as that *which goeth into the mouth, doth not defile a Man, because it is put forth again*, and so goeth to the *Dung-hill*; neither doth any thing which Man *eateth, purifie him*, or *fit* him for *Heaven*. What is said here in *general*, may serve for an *Introduction*, not only to this *Proposition*, but also to the other concerning the *Supper*. Of these *Sacraments* (so called) *Baptism* is always *first* numbered, which is the *Subject* of the *present Proposition*; in whose *Explanation* I shall *first* demonstrate and prove *Our Judgment*; and then *Answer* the *Objections*, and *Refute* the *Sentiments* of our *Opposers*. As to the *first part*, these things following, which are briefly comprehended in the *Proposition*, come to be proposed and proved.

That *outward Washing* doth not *cleanse* the *Heart*;

Part I.

§ III. *First*: *That there is but* One Baptism, *as well as but* One Lord, One Faith, *&c.* Prop. I.

Secondly, *That this* one Baptism, *which is the* Baptism *of* Christ, *is not a washing* II.

with, or dipping in Water, *but a being baptized by the* Spirit.

III. *Thirdly: That the* Baptism *of* John *was but a* Figure *of this, and therefore, as the* Figure, *to give place to the* Substance; *which though it be to continue, yet the other is ceased.*

Prop. I. As for the *first*, viz. *That there is but one Baptism*, there needs no other Proof, than the Words of the *Text*, Eph. 4. 5. *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism*; where the Apostle positively and plainly affirms, that as there is but *One Body, One Spirit, One Faith, One God*, &c. so there is but *One Baptism.*

One *Baptism* proved.

Obj. 1. As to what is commonly alledged by way of *Explanation* upon the *Text*, *That the* Baptism of Water *and of the* Spirit *make up this* One Baptism *by vertue of this Sacramental Union.*

Answ. I *Answer*; This *Exposition* hath taken place, not because grounded upon the *Testimony* of the *Scripture*, but because it *wrests* the *Scripture*, to make it suit to their Principle of *Water-Baptism:* and so there needs no other *Reply*, but to deny it, as being repugnant to the plain words of the *Text*, which saith not, *That there are Two Baptisms*, to wit, one of *Water*, the other of the *Spirit*, which do make up the

Whether *Two Baptisms* do make up the *One?*

One

One Baptiſm; but plainly, that *there is One Baptiſm*, as there is *One Faith* and *One God*. Now there goeth not *Two Faiths*, nor *Two Gods*, nor *Two Spirits*, nor *Two Bodies*, whereof the one is *Outward* and *Elementary*, and the other *Spiritual* and *Pure*, to the making up of the *One Faith*, the *One God*, the *One Body*, and the *One Spirit*; ſo neither ought there to go *Two Baptiſms* to make up the *One Baptiſm*.

But *Secondly*: If it be ſaid, *The* Baptiſm *is but One, whereof* Water *is the one part, to wit, the Sign*; *and the* Spirit, *the thing ſignified, the other*. Obj. 2.

I *Anſwer*: This yet more confirmeth our Doctrine: For if *Water* be only the *Sign*, it is not the *Matter* of the *One Baptiſm* (as ſhall further hereafter by its *Definition* in *Scripture* appear) and we are to take the *One Baptiſm* for the *Matter* of it, not for the *Sign*, or *Figure* and *Type* that went before. Even as where *Chriſt* is called the *One Offering* in *Scripture*, though he was *Typified* by many *Sacrifices* and *Offerings* under the *Law*, we underſtand only by the *One Offering* his *Offering* himſelf upon the *Croſs*: whereof though thoſe many *Offerings* were *Signs* and *Types*; yet we ſay not, that they go together with that *Offering* of *Chriſt*, to make up the *One Of-* *Anſw.*

If *Water* be the *Type*, the *Subſtance* muſt remain.

fering: So neither though *Water-Baptiſm* was a *Sign* of *Chriſt's Baptiſm*, will it follow, that it goeth now to make up the *Baptiſm* of *Chriſt*. If any ſhould be ſo *Abſurd*, as to affirm, *That this* One Baptiſm *here, were the* Baptiſm *of* Water, *and not* of the Spirit: That were fooliſhly to contradict the poſitive *Teſtimony* of the *Scripture*, which ſaith the contrary; as by what followeth will more amply appear.

Prop II. Proof I. *Secondly*: *That this* One Baptiſm, *which is the* Baptiſm *of* Chriſt, *is not a Waſhing with Water*, appears *firſt*, from the *Teſtimony* of *John*, the proper and peculiar *Adminiſtrator* of *Water-Baptiſm*, Matt. 3. 11. *I indeed baptize you with Water unto Repentance; but he that cometh after me, is mightier than I, whoſe ſhooes I am not worthy to bear: he ſhall baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt, and with Fire.* Here *John* mentions *two manners* of *Baptiſings*, and *two different Baptiſms*, the one with *Water*, and the other with the *Spirit*; the one whereof *he* was the *Miniſter* of, the other whereof *Chriſt* was the *Miniſter* of: and ſuch as were *baptized* with the *firſt*, were not therefore *baptized* with the *ſecond*: *I indeed baptize you, but he ſhall baptize you.* Though in the preſent time they were *baptized* with the *Baptiſm* of *Water*; yet they were not

They that had *John's Baptiſm*, had not therefore *Chriſt's*.

as

as yet, but were *to be baptized* with the *Baptiſm* of *Chriſt*. From all which I thus Argue,

If thoſe that were baptized *with the* Baptiſm *of* Water, *were not therefore* baptized *with the* Baptiſm *of* Chriſt; *then the* Baptiſm *of* Water *is not the* Baptiſm *of* Chriſt. Arg. 1.

But the *firſt* is *true*:

Therefore alſo the *laſt*.

And again,

If he, that *truly and really adminiſtred* the Baptiſm *of* Water, *did notwithſtanding* declare, *That he neither* could, *nor did* baptize *with the* Baptiſm *of* Chriſt; *Then the* Baptiſm *of* Water *is not the* Baptiſm *of* Chriſt. Arg. 2.

But the *firſt* is *true*:

Therefore, *&c.*

And indeed to underſtand it otherwiſe, would make *John*'s Words void of *good ſenſe*: For if their *Baptiſms* had been all *one*, why ſhould he have ſo preciſely *Contradiſtinguiſhed* them? Why ſhould he have ſaid, that thoſe whom he had already *baptized*, ſhould yet be *baptized* by *another* Baptiſm?

If it be urged, That *Baptiſm with Water was the one part, and that with the Spirit the other part; or Effect only of the former*. Object.

Answ. I *Answer*: This *Exposition* contradicts the plain words of the *Text*. For he saith not, *I baptize you with Water; and he, that cometh after, shall produce the* Effects *of this my* Baptism *in you by the* Spirit, *&c.* or *he shall accomplish this* Baptism *in you*; but *he shall Baptize you.* So then, if we understand the Word *truly* and *properly*, when he saith, *I Baptize you*, as consenting, that thereby is really signified, that he did *baptize* with the *Baptism* of *Water*; we must needs, unless we offer Violence to the *Text*, understand the other *part* of the *sentence* the same way; that where he adds presently, *But he shall baptize you*, &c. that he understood it of their being *truly* to be *baptized* with *another Baptism*, than what he did *baptize* with: Else it had been *Non-sense* for him thus to have *Contradistinguished* them.

One Baptism is no Part nor Effect of the other.

Proof II. *Secondly*: This is further confirmed by the *Saying* of *Christ* himself, *Acts* 1. 4, 5. *But wait for the promise of the Father, which* (saith he) *ye have heard of me*: *For* John *truly* baptized *with* Water, *but ye shall be* baptized *with th* Holy Ghost *not many days hence.* There can scarce *Two* places of Scripture run more parallel, than this doth with the *former* a little before mentioned, and therefore concludeth the same way,

Who were baptized by John, were still to wait for Christ's Baptism with the Spirit.

as

as did the other. For Chriſt there grants fully, that *John* compleated his *Baptiſm*, as to the *matter* and *ſubſtance* of it: *John* ſaith he, *truly baptized with Water*; which is as much as if he had ſaid, *John did truly and fully Adminiſter the Baptiſm of* Water; *But ye ſhall be Baptized with*, &c. This ſheweth, that they were to be *Baptized* with ſome *other Baptiſm*, than the *Baptiſm* of *Water*; and that, although they were formerly *Baptized* with the *Baptiſm* of *Water*, yet not with that of *Chriſt*, which they were to be *Baptized* with.

Thirdly; *Peter* obſerves the ſame diſtinction, *Acts* 11. 16. *Then remembred I the word of the Lord, how that he ſaid*, John *indeed Baptized with Water*; *but ye ſhall be Baptized with the Holy Ghoſt.* The Apoſtle makes this Application upon the *Holy Ghoſt's falling upon them*; whence he infers, that they were then *Baptized* with the *Baptiſm* of the *Spirit*: As to what is urged from his *Calling* afterwards for *Water*, to it ſhall be hereafter ſpoken. From all which *Three Sentences* relative one to another, *Firſt* of *John*, *Secondly* of *Chriſt*, and *Thirdly* of *Peter*, it doth evidently follow, that ſuch as were truly and really *Baptized* with the *Baptiſm* of *Water*, were notwithſtanding not *Baptized* with the

Proof III. The *Baptiſm* with the Holy *Ghoſt*, and that with *Water*, differ.

Bap-

Baptiſm of the *Spirit*; which is that of *Chriſt*: and ſuch as truly and really did adminiſter the *Baptiſm* of *Water*, did in ſo doing, not adminiſter the *Baptiſm* of *Chriſt*. So that, if there be now but *One Baptiſm*, as we have already proved, we may ſafely conclude, that it is that of the *Spirit*, and not of *Water*; elſe it would follow, that *the One Baptiſm*, which now continues, were the *Baptiſm of Water*, i. e. *John*'s Baptiſm, and not the *Baptiſm* of the *Spirit*, i. e. *Chriſt's*, which were moſt Abſurd.

Object. If it be ſaid further, That *though the Baptiſm of* John, *before* Chriſt's *was adminiſtred, was different from it, as being the Figure only; yet now that both it as the* Figure, *and that of the* Spirit *as the* Subſtance, *is neceſſary to make up the* One Baptiſm.

Anſw. I Anſwer: This urgeth nothing, unleſs it be granted alſo, that *both* of them belong to the *Eſſence* of *Baptiſm*; ſo that *Baptiſm* is not to be accounted as *truly Adminiſtred*, where both are not: which none of our *Adverſaries* will acknowledge; but on the contrary account not only all thoſe *truly Baptized* with the *Baptiſm* of *Chriſt*, who are *Baptized* with *Water*, though they be uncertain whether they be *Baptized* with the *Spirit*, or not; but they even account ſuch

Water Baptiſm is not the *true Baptiſm* of Chriſt.

ſuch *truly Baptized* with the *Baptiſm* of *Chriſt*, becauſe *Sprinkled*, or *Baptized* with *Water*, though it be manifeſt and moſt certain, that they are not *Baptized* with the *Spirit*, as being *Enemies* thereunto in their *Hearts* by *wicked Works*. So here, by their own Confeſſion, *Baptiſm* with *Water* is without the *Spirit*: Wherefore we may far ſafer conclude, that the *Baptiſm* of the *Spirit*, which is that of *Chriſt*, is and may be without that of *Water*; as appears in that *Acts* 11. where *Peter* teſtifies of theſe Men, that *they were Baptized with the Spirit, though not then Baptized with Water*. And indeed, the *Controverſie* in this, as in moſt other things, ſtands betwixt us and our *Oppoſers*, in that they not only oftentimes prefer the *Form* and *Shadow* to the *Power* and *Subſtance*, by denominating perſons, as *Inheritors* and *Poſſeſſors* of the thing, from their having the *Form* and *Shadow*, though really wanting the *Power* and *Subſtance*; and not admitting thoſe to be ſo denominated, who have the *Power* and *Subſtance*, if they want the *Form* and *Shadow*. This appears evidently, in that they account thoſe *truly Baptized* with the *One Baptiſm* of *Chriſt*, who are not *baptized* with the *Spirit* (which in Scripture is particularly called the *Baptiſm* of *Chriſt*)

if

if they be only *baptized* with *Water*; which themselves yet Confess to be but the *Shadow*, or *Figure*. And moreover, in that they account not those, who are surely *baptized* with the *Baptism* of the *Spirit*, *baptized*, neither will they have them so denominate, unless they be also *Sprinkled* with, or *Dipped* in *Water*: But we on the Contrary, do always prefer the *Power* to the *Form*, the *Substance* to the *Shadow*; and where the *Substance* and *Power* is, we doubt not to denominate the *Person* accordingly, though the *Form* be wanting. And therefore we always seek first and plead for the *Substance* and *Power*, as knowing that to be *indispensibly necessary*; though the *Form* sometimes may be *dispensed* with, and the *Figure* or *Type* may *cease*, when the *Substance* and *Anti-type* comes to be enjoyed; as it doth in this Case, which shall hereafter be made appear.

The *Baptism* of the *Spirit* needeth no *Sprinkling* or *Dipping* in *Water*.

Proof IV. § IV. *Fourthly*: That the *One Baptism* of *Christ* is not a *Washing* with *Water*, appears from 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. *The like Figure, whereunto even* Baptism *doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the Flesh, but the answer of a good Conscience towards God) by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.* So plain a *definition* of *Baptism* is not in all the *Bible*: and therefore, seeing it

The plainest *Definition* of the *Baptism* of Christ in all the *Bible*.

it is ſo *Plain*, it may well be preferred to all the coined *definitions* of the *School-men*. The Apoſtle tells us *firſt*, *Negatively*, what it is not, *viz. Not a putting away of the filth of the Fleſh*; then ſurely it is not a *Waſhing* with *Water*, ſince that is ſo. *Secondly*, He tells us *Affirmatively*, what it is: *viz. The Anſwer of a good Conſcience towards God, by the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt*: where he Affirmatively Defines it to be *the Anſwer* (or *Confeſſion*, as the *Syriack* Verſion hath it) *of a good Conſcience*. Now, this *Anſwer* cannot be, but where the *Spirit* of *God* hath purified the *Soul*, and the *Fire* of his *Judgment* hath burned up the unrighteous nature; and thoſe, in whom this *Work* is wrought, may be truly ſaid to be *baptized* with the *Baptiſm* of *Chriſt*, i. e. of the *Spirit* and of *Fire*. Whatever way then we take this *Definition* of the Apoſtle of *Chriſt's Baptiſm*, it confirmeth our ſentence: For if we take the *firſt* or *Negative* part, *viz. That it is not a putting away of the filth of the Fleſh*; then it will follow, that *Water-Baptiſm* is not it, becauſe that is a *putting away of the filth of the Fleſh*. If we take the *ſecond* and *Affirmative Definition*, to wit, *That it is the Anſwer*, or *Confeſſion of a good Conſcience*, &c. then *Water-baptiſm* is not it; ſince,

Water Baptiſm ſhut out from the *Baptiſm* of *Chriſt*.

ſince, as our *Adverſaries* will not deny, *Water-baptiſm* doth not always imply it, neither is it any neceſſary Conſequence thereof. Moreover, the Apoſtle in this place doth ſeem eſpecially to *guard* againſt thoſe, that might eſteem *Water-baptiſm* the true *Baptiſm* of Chriſt; becauſe (leſt by the *Compariſon* induced by him in the preceding verſe, betwixt the Souls that were *ſaved* in *Noah*'s *Ark*, and us, that are now *ſaved* by *Baptiſm*; leſt, I ſay, any ſhould have thence haſtily concluded, that becauſe the former were *ſaved by Water*, this place muſt needs be taken to ſpeak of *Water-Baptiſm*) to prevent ſuch a miſtake, he plainly affirms, that it is not that, but another thing. He ſaith not, that it is the *Water*, or *the putting away of the filth of the Fleſh, as accompanied with the* Anſwer of a good Conſcience, *whereof the one*, viz. *the* Water, *is the* Sacramental Element *adminiſtred by the* Miniſter; *and the other, the* Grace *or thing ſignified, Conferred by* Chriſt; but plainly, *That it is not the putting away*, &c. than which there can be nothing more manifeſt to Men unprejudicate and judicious. Moreover, *Peter* calls this here, which ſaves, the *Antitypos*, the *Anti-type*, or the *thing figured*, whereas it is uſually tranſlated, as if *the like Figure did now ſave us*; there-

thereby inſinuating, that as they were *Saved* by *Water* in the *Ark*, ſo are we now by *Water-baptiſm*. But this *Interpretation* croſſeth his ſenſe, he preſently after declaring the Contrary, as hath above been obſerved: and likewiſe it would Contradict the *Opinion* of all our *Oppoſers*. For *Proteſtants* deny it to be abſolutely neceſſary to *Salvation*: And though *Papiſts* ſay, *None are ſaved without it*; yet in this they admit an *Exception*, as of *Martyrs*, &c. and they will not ſay, that all that have it, are *Saved* by *Water-baptiſm*: which they ought to ſay, if they will underſtand by *Baptiſm* (by which the Apoſtle ſaith, we are *Saved*) *Water-baptiſm*, for ſeeing we are *ſaved* by this *Baptiſm*, as thoſe that were in the *Ark*, were *Saved* by *Water*, and that all thoſe, that were in the *Ark*, were *Saved* by *Water*; it would then follow, that all thoſe, that have this *Baptiſm*, are *Saved* by it. Now this *Conſequence* would be *falſe*, if it were underſtood of *Water-baptiſm*; becauſe many, by the Confeſſion of all, are *baptized* with *Water*, that are not *ſaved*: but this *Conſequence* holds moſt *true*, if it be underſtood, as we do, of the *Baptiſm* of the *Spirit*; ſince none can have this *Anſwer of a good Conſcience*, and abiding in it, not be *Saved* by it.

The *Proteſtants* deny *Water-baptiſm* its *abſolute neceſſity* to mens *Salvation*: Altho' the *Papiſts* ſay, *none can be ſav'd without it*, yet grant *Exceptions*.

Fifthly:

Proof V. The *Effects* and *Fruits* of the *Baptism* of Christ.

Fifthly: That the *One Baptism of Christ is not a Washing with Water*, as it hath been proved by the *Definition* of the *One Baptism*, so it is also manifest from the *Necessary Fruits* and *Effects* of it, which are *three-times* particularly expressed by the Apostle *Paul*: As *first*, Rom. 6. 3, 4. where he saith, That *so many of them, as were* baptized *into Jesus Christ, were* baptized *into his Death*; *buried with him by* Baptism *into Death, that they should walk in Newness of Life*: *Secondly*, to the *Gal.* 3. 27. he saith positively, For *as many of you, as have been* baptized *into Christ, have put on Christ*: and *Thirdly*, to the *Col.* 2. 12. he saith, That they were *Buried with him in Baptism*, and *Risen with him through the Faith of the operation of God*. It is to be observed here, that the Apostle speaks generally, without any *Exclusive Term*, but *Comprehensive* of all: he saith not, *Some of you, that were* baptized *into Christ, have put on Christ*; but *As many of you*: which is as much, as if he had said, *Every one of you, that hath been* baptized *into Christ, hath put on Christ*. Whereby it is evident, that this is not meant of *Water-baptism*, but of the *Baptism* of the *Spirit*; because else it would follow, that, whosoever had been *baptized* with *Water-baptism*, had *put on Christ*;

Which *Effects Water-Baptism* wants.

Chriſt, and were *Riſen* with him; which all acknowledge to be moſt *Abſurd*. Now ſuppoſing, all the *Viſible Members* of the *Churches* of *Rome*, *Galatia* and *Coloſſ* had been outwardly *baptized* with *Water*, (I do not ſay, they were; but our *Adverſaries* will not only readily *grant* it, but alſo *contend* for it) ſuppoſe (I ſay) the Caſe ſo, they will not ſay, they had *all put on Chriſt*; ſince divers Expreſſions in theſe *Epiſtles* to them, ſhew the contrary. So that the Apoſtle cannot mean *Baptiſm* with *Water*; and yet that he meaneth the *Baptiſm of Chriſt*, i. e. *of the Spirit*, cannot be denied; or that the *Baptiſm*, wherewith theſe were *baptized* (of whom the Apoſtle here teſtifies, that they had *put on Chriſt*) was the *One Baptiſm*, I think none will call in queſtion. Now admit, as our *Adverſaries Contend*, that many in theſe Churches, who had been *baptized* with *Water*, had not *put on Chriſt*; it will follow, that notwithſtanding that *Water-baptiſm*, they were not *baptized* into *Chriſt*, or with the *Baptiſm* of *Chriſt*; ſeeing *as many of them, as were baptized* into *Chriſt*, *had put on Chriſt*, &c. From all which I thus Argue;

If the Baptiſm *with* Water *were the* One Baptiſm, *i. e. the* Baptiſm *of* Chriſt, Arg. 1.

as many as were baptized with Water, *would have* put on Chriſt.

But the laſt *is* falſe;

Therefore alſo the firſt.

And again;

Arg. 2. *Since as many, as are* baptized *into* Chriſt, *i. e. with the* One Baptiſm, *which is the* Baptiſm *of* Chriſt, *have* put on Chriſt; *Then* Water-baptiſm *is not the* One Baptiſm, *viz. the* Baptiſm *of* Chriſt.

But the firſt *is* true:

Therefore alſo the laſt.

Prop. III. Prove'. § V. *Thirdly: Since* John's Baptiſm *was a* Figure, *and ſeeing, the* Figure *gives way to the* Subſtance, *albeit the thing* figured *remain,* to wit, *the* One Baptiſm *of* Chriſt, *yet the other ceaſeth, which was the* Baptiſm *of* John.

1. *John's Baptiſm was of Chriſt's a Figure.* That *John's Baptiſm* was a *Figure* of *Chriſt's Baptiſm,* I judge will not readily be denied; but in Caſe it ſhould, it can eaſily be proved from the *Nature* of it. *John's Baptiſm* was *a being* baptized *with* Water; but *Chriſt's* is a *baptizing* with the *Spirit*: Therefore *John's Baptiſm* muſt have been a *Figure* of *Chriſt's.* But further, that *Water-baptiſm* was *John's Baptiſm,* will not be denied; That *Water-baptiſm* is not *Chriſt's Baptiſm,* is already proved.

proved. From which doth ariſe the *Confirmation* of our *Propoſition*, thus;

There is no Baptiſm *to continue now, but the* One Baptiſm *of* Chriſt.

Therefore Water-baptiſm *is not to continue now; becauſe it is not the* Baptiſm *of* Chriſt. Arg.

II. *John's Baptiſm is Ceas'd, our Oppoſers confeſs.*

That *John*'s *Baptiſm* is *Ceaſed*, many of our *Adverſaries* confeſs: but, if any ſhould alledge it otherwiſe, it may be eaſily proved by the expreſs words of *John*, not only as being inſinuated there, where he *Contradiſtinguiſhed* his *Baptiſm* from that of *Chriſt*; but particularly where he ſaith *John* 3. 30. *He* [Chriſt] *muſt Increaſe, but I* [John] *muſt Decreaſe.* From whence it clearly follows, that the *Increaſing* or taking place of *Chriſt's Baptiſm* is the *Decreaſing* or aboliſhing of *John's Baptiſm*: ſo that, if *Water-baptiſm* was a particular part of *John's Miniſtry*, and is no part of *Chriſt's Baptiſm*, as we have already proved, it will neceſſarily follow, that it is not to *Continue.*

If Water-baptiſm *had been to continue a* Perpetual Ordinance *of* Chriſt *in his* Church, *he would either have* practiſed *it himſelf, or* Commanded *his Apoſtles ſo to do.* Arg.

But that he practiſed *it not, the Scripture*

plainly affirms, John 4. 2. *And that he* Commanded *his Diſciples to* baptize *with* Water, *I could never yet read.* [As for what is alledged, that *Mat.* 28. 19, &c. (where he bids them *baptize*) is to be underſtood of *Water-baptiſm*, that is but to *beg* the *Queſtion*, and the grounds for that ſhall be hereafter examined.]

Therefore to baptize *with* Water *is no* Perpetual Ordinance *of Chriſt to his Church.*

This hath had the more Weight with me, becauſe I find not any *ſtanding Ordinance* or *Appointment* of Chriſt neceſſary to Chriſtians, for which we have not either *Chriſt's* own *Practice*, or *Command*, as to obey all the Commandments, which comprehend both our *Duty* towards *God* and *Man*, &c. and where the *Goſpel* requires more than the *Law*; which is abundantly ſignified in the 5*th* and 6*th* Chapters of *Matthew*, and elſewhere. Beſides as to the *Duties* of *Worſhip*, he exhorts us to *Meet*, promiſing his *Preſence*; commands to *Pray*, *Preach*, *Watch*, &c. and gives *Precepts* concerning ſome *Temporary things*, as the *Waſhing* of *one anothers Feet*, the *breaking* of *Bread*, hereafter to be diſcuſſed: only for this one thing of *baptiſing* with *Water* (though ſo ear-

earneſtly contended for) we find not any *Precept* of *Chriſt*.

§ VI. But to make *Water-baptiſm* a neceſſary *Inſtitution* of the *Chriſtian Religion*, which is Pure and Spiritual, and not Carnal and Ceremonial, is to derogate from the *New Covenant-Diſpenſation*, and ſet up the *Legal Rites* and *Ceremonies*, of which this of *Baptiſm*, or *Waſhing* with *Water*, was one; as appears from *Heb.* 9. 10. where the Apoſtle ſpeaking thereof, ſaith, that it ſtood *only in Meats and Drinks, and divers Baptiſms, and Carnal Ordinances impoſed, until the Time of Reformation*: If then the *Time* of *Reformation*, or the *Diſpenſation* of the *Goſpel*, which puts an end to the *Shadows*, be come, then ſuch *Baptiſms* and *Carnal Ordinances* are no more to be impoſed, For how *Baptiſm* with *Water* comes now to be a *Spiritual Ordinance* more than before in the time of the *Law*, doth not appear; ſeeing it is but *Water* ſtill, and a *Waſhing* of the *Outward Man*, and a *putting away* of the *filth* of the *Fleſh* ſtill: And as before thoſe, that were ſo *Waſhed*, were not thereby made *perfect*, as pertaining to the *Conſcience*, neither are they at this day; as our *Adverſaries* muſt needs acknowledge, and Experience abundantly ſheweth. So that the matter of it, which

III. The *Goſpel* puts an end to *Carnal Ordinances*.

is a *Washing* with *Water*, and the Effects of it, which is only an *Outward Cleansing*, being still the same, how comes *Water-baptism* to be less a *Carnal Ordinance* now, than before?

Obj. 1. If it be said, That *God confers inward Grace upon some, that are now baptized?*

Answ. So no doubt he did also upon some, that used those *Baptisms* among the *Jews*.

Obj. 2. Or if it be said; *Because 'tis commanded by Christ now under the New Covenant.*

Answ. I Answer *First*, That's to beg the Question; of which hereafter.

But *Secondly*, We find, That where the *Matter* of *Ordinances* is the same, and the *End* the same, they are never accounted more or less *Spiritual*, becaufe of their *different Times*. Now, was not God the Author of the *Purifications* and *Baptisms* under the *Law?* Was not *Water* the *Matter* of them, which is so now? Was not the *End* of them to signifie an *Inward Purifying* by an *Outward Washing?* And is not that alledged to be the *End* still? And are the necessary *Effects* or *Consequences* of it any better now, than before, since men are now by vertue of *Water-baptism*, as a *necessary Consequence* of it, no more than before made *Inwardly Clean?* And if some by *God's Grace*, that are *baptized* with *Water*, are

Men are no more *now* than *before* by *Water-baptism* inwardly cleansed.

are *inwardly purified*, ſo were ſome alſo under the *Law*: So that this is not any *Neceſſary Conſequence* nor *Effect* neither of this nor that *Baptiſm*. It is then plainly Repugnant to *Right Reaſon*, as well as to the *Scripture-Teſtimony*, to affirm that to be a *Spiritual Ordinance* now, which was a *Carnal Ordinance* before, if it be ſtill the ſame both as to its *Author*, *Matter* and *End*, however made to vary in ſome ſmall *Circumſtances*: The *Spirituality* of the *New Covenant*, and of its *Worſhip* eſtabliſhed by Chriſt, conſiſted not in ſuch ſuperficial *Alterations* of *Circumſtances*; but after another manner. Therefore let our *Adverſaries* ſhew us, if they can, (without *begging* the *Queſtion*, and building upon ſome one or other of their own *Principles* denied by us) wherever Chriſt appointed or ordained any *Inſtitution* or *Obſervation* under the *New Covenant*, as belonging to the Nature of it, or ſuch a neceſſary part of its *Worſhip*, as is *perpetually* to *Continue*, which being one in *Subſtance* and *Effects*, (I ſpeak of *neceſſary* not *accidental* Effects) yet becauſe of ſome ſmall *difference* in *Form* or *Circumſtance*, was before *Carnal*, notwithſtanding it was *commanded* by *God* under the *Law*, but now is become *Spiritual*, becauſe *commanded* by *Chriſt* under the *Go-*

ſpel? And if they cannot do this, then if *Water-baptiſm* was once a *Carnal Ordinance*, as the Apoſtle poſitively affirms it to have been, it remains a *Carnal Ordinance* ſtill; and if a *Carnal Ordinance*, then no *neceſſary part* of the *Goſpel*, or *New Covenant-Diſpenſation*; and if *no neceſſary part* of it, then not needful to *Continue*, nor to be *Practiſed* by ſuch, as live and walk under this *Diſpenſation*. But in this, as in moſt other things (according as we have often obſerved) our *Adverſaries Judaize*, and renouncing the *Glorious* and *Spiritual Priviledges* of the *New Covenant*, are ſticking in, and cleaving to the *Rudiments* of the *Old*, both in *Doctrine* and *Worſhip*, as being more ſuited and agreeable to their *Carnal Apprehenſions* and *Natural Senſes*. But we on the contrary travel above all to lay hold upon, and cleave unto the *Light* of the *Glorious Goſpel* Revealed unto us: And the *Harmony* of the *Truth* we profeſs in this, may appear, by briefly obſerving, how in all things we follow the *Spiritual Goſpel* of Chriſt, as contradiſtinguiſhed from the Carnality of the *Legal Diſpenſation*; while our *Adverſaries* through rejecting this *Goſpel*, are ſtill labouring under the burthen of the *Law*, which neither they, nor their Fathers were able to bear.

The *Law* diſtinguiſht from the *Goſpel*.

For

For the Law *and* Rule *of the* Old Covenant *and* Jews *was Outward, written in Tables of* Stone *and Parchments*: So alſo is that of our *Adverſaries*. *But the* Law *of the* New Covenant *is Inward and Perpetual, written in the Heart*: So is ours. The *Outward Baptiſm, Worſhip, Law,* diſtinguiſht from the *Inward.*

The Worſhip *of the* Jews *was Outward and Carnal, limited to ſet Times, Places and Perſons, and performed according to Set, Preſcribed Forms and Obſervations*; ſo is that of our *Adverſaries*. *But the* Worſhip *of the* New Covenant *is neither limited to Time, Place nor Perſon, but is performed in the Spirit, and in Truth, and is not acted according to ſet Forms and Preſcriptions, but as the Spirit of God immediately acts, moves and leads, whether it be to Preach, Pray, or Sing*; and ſuch is alſo our *Worſhip*.

So likewiſe the Baptiſm *among the* Jews *under the Law was an outward Waſhing with outward Water, only to Typifie an inward Purification of the Soul, which did not neceſſarily follow upon thoſe that were thus baptized*: But the *Baptiſm* of Chriſt under the *Goſpel*, is the *Baptiſm* of the *Spirit* and of *Fire*; *not the putting away of the filth of the Fleſh, but the Anſwer of a good Conſcience towards God*: And ſuch is the *Baptiſm*, that we labour to be *baptized* withal, and contend for.

§ VII.

Arg. § VII. But again: If *Water-baptiſm* had been an *Ordinance* of the *Goſpel*, then the Apoſtle *Paul* would have been ſent to *Adminiſter* it; but he declares poſitively 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. *That Chriſt ſent him not to* Baptize, *but to Preach the Goſpel.* The *Reaſon* of that Conſequence is undeniable, becauſe the Apoſtle *Paul*'s *Commiſſion* was as large, as that of any of them, and conſequently he being in ſpecial Manner the *Apoſtle* of *Chriſt* to the *Gentiles*, if *Water-baptiſm* (as our *Adverſaries* contend) be to be accounted the *badge* of *Chriſtianity*, he had more need than any of the reſt to be *ſent* to *baptize* with Water, that he might *Mark* the *Gentiles Converted* by him, with that *Chriſtian Sign.* But indeed, the *Reaſon* holds better thus: That ſince *Paul* was the *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles*, and that in his *Miniſtry* he doth through all (as by his *Epiſtles* appears) labour to wean them from the former *Jewiſh Ceremonies* and *Obſervations*, (though in ſo doing he was ſometimes undeſervedly judged by others of his *Brethren*, who were unwilling to lay aſide thoſe *Ceremonies*) therefore his *Commiſſion* (though as full, as to the *Preaching* of the *Goſpel* and *New Covenant-Diſpenſation*, as that of the other Apoſtles) did not require of him, that he ſhould lead thoſe

IV. That *Water-baptiſm* is no *Badge* of *Chriſtians*, like *Circumciſion* of the *Jews.*

thoſe *Converts* into ſuch *Jewiſh Obſervations*, and *Baptiſms*, however that Practice was *Indulged* in, and *practiſed* by the other Apoſtles among their *Jewiſh Proſelites*: for which cauſe *he thanks God, that he* baptized *ſo few*; intimating, that what he did therein, he did not by vertue of his *Apoſtolick Commiſſion*, but rather in *Condeſcendence* to their *Weakneſs*; even as at another time he *Circumciſed Timothy*. 1 Cor. 1. 14. *Paul* was not ſent to *baptize*.

Our *Adverſaries*, to evade the Truth of this *Teſtimony*, uſually alledge, *That by this is only to be underſtood, that he was not ſent* principally *to baptize, not that he was not ſent at all*. Obj. 1.

But this *Expoſition*, ſince it *Contradicts* the poſitive Words of the *Text*, and has no better Foundation, than the *Affirmation* of its *Aſſertors*, is juſtly rejected as *ſpurious*, until they bring ſome better Proof for it: He ſaith not, *I was not ſent* principally *to baptize*; but, *I was not ſent to baptize*. *Anſw.*

As for what they urge by way of *Confirmation* from other places of Scripture, where [*not*] is to be ſo taken, as where it's ſaid, *I will have Mercy, and* not *Sacrifice*, which is to be underſtood, that *God* requires *principally Mercy*, not excluding *Sacrifices*. Confirm. Matth. 9. 13. Hoſ. 6. 6.

Refut. I say, this *Place* is abundantly *Explained* by the following words [*and the Knowledge of God more than burnt-Offerings:*] by which it clearly appears, that *burnt-Offerings*, which are one with *Sacrifices*, are not Excluded. But there is no such word added in that of *Paul*, and therefore the *Parity* is not demonstrated to be alike, and consequently the *Instance* not sufficient; unless they can prove, that it ought so to be admitted here: Else we might interpret by the same Rule all other *Places* of *Scripture* the same way; As where the Apostle saith, 1 *Cor.* 2. 5. *That your Faith might not stand in the Wisdom of Men, but in the Power of God*; it might be understood, it shall not stand *Principally* so. How might the *Gospel* by this Liberty of *Interpretation* be *Perverted*?

Obj. 2. If it be said, *That the Abuse of this* Baptism *among the* Corinthians, *in dividing themselves according to the Persons, by whom they were* baptized, *made the Apostle speak so; but that the* Abuse *of a thing doth not abolish it.*

Answ. I Answer; It is true, it doth not, provided the thing be *lawful* and *necessary*; and that, no doubt, the *Abuse* aboveSaid gave the Apostle occasion so to write: But let it from this be considered, how the Apostle

poſtle excludes *Baptizing*, not *Preaching*, though the *Abuſe* [mark] proceeded from that no leſs, than from the other. For theſe *Corinthians* did denominate themſelves from thoſe different Perſons, by whoſe *Preaching* (as well as from thoſe, by whom they were *baptized*) they were *Converted*, as by the 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. ver. of the 3*d Ch.* may appear; and yet for to remove that *Abuſe*, the Apoſtle doth not ſay, *he was not ſent to preach*; nor yet doth he rejoice, that he had only *preached* to a *few*; becauſe *preaching* being a *ſtanding Ordinance* in the *Church*, is not becauſe of any *Abuſe*, that the *Devil* may tempt any to make of it, to be *forborn*, by ſuch as are called to perform it by the *Spirit* of *God*; wherefore the Apoſtle accordingly *Chap.* 3. 8, 9. informs them as to that, how to *Remove* that *Abuſe*: But as to *Water-baptiſm*, for that it was no ſtanding *Ordinance* of *Chriſt*, but only practiſed as in *Condeſcendence* to the *Jews*, and by ſome Apoſtles to ſome *Gentiles* alſo, there ſo ſoon as the Apoſtle perceived the *Abuſe* of it; he let the *Corinthians* underſtand, how little ſtreſs was to be laid upon it; by ſhewing them that he was glad, that he had adminiſtred this *Ceremony* to ſo *few* of them, and by telling them plainly that it was no

That *Preaching* is a *ſtanding Ordinance*, and not to be *forborn*.

part

part of his *Commiſſion*, neither that, which he was ſent to *Adminiſter*.

Query. Some ask us, *How we know, that* Baptizing *here is meant of* Water, *and not of the* Spirit? *Which if it be, then it will exclude* Baptiſm *of the* Spirit, *as well as of* Water.

Anſw. I Anſwer: Such as ask the Queſtion, I ſuppoſe ſpeak it not as doubting, that this was ſaid of *Water-baptiſm*; which is more than manifeſt. For ſince the Apoſtle *Paul*'s *Meſſage* was *to turn People from Darkneſs to Light, and Convert them to God*; and that as many as are thus *turned* and *converted* (*ſo as to have the Anſwer of a good Conſcience towards God, and to have put on Chriſt, and be ariſen with him in Newneſs of Life*) are *baptized* with the *Baptiſm* of the *Spirit*; but who will ſay, that only theſe *few* mentioned there to be *baptized* by *Paul*, were come to this? or that to *turn* or bring them to this Condition, was not (even admitting our *Adverſaries* Interpretation) as *principally* a part of *Paul*'s *Miniſtry*, as any other? Since then our *Adverſaries* do take this place for *Water-baptiſm* (as indeed it is) we may lawfully, taking it ſo alſo, urge it upon them. Why the Word *Baptiſm* and *baptizing* is uſed by the Apoſtle, where that of *Water*, and not of the *Spirit*, is only underſtood, ſhall hereafter be

That which *Converts to Chriſt*, is *Baptiſm* of the *Spirit*.

be ſpoken to. I come now to conſider the *Reaſons* alledged by ſuch as plead for *Water-baptiſm*; which are alſo the *Objections* uſed againſt the *Diſcontinuance* of it. Part II.

§ VIII. *Firſt*, Some Object, *That Chriſt, who had the Spirit above meaſure, was notwithſtanding baptized with Water.* As *Nic. Arnold.* againſt this *Theſe*, Sect. 46. of his *Theological Exercitation.* Obj. 1.

I Anſwer: So was he alſo *Circumciſed*; it will not follow from thence, that *Circumciſion* is to *Continue.* For it behoved *Chriſt* to *fulfil all Righteouſneſs*, not only the *Miniſtry* of *John*, but the *Law* alſo; therefore did he obſerve the *Jewiſh Feaſts* and *Rites*, and kept the *Paſſover*: It will not then follow, that *Chriſtians* ought to do ſo now. And therefore Chriſt *Matth.* 3. 15. gives *John* this reaſon of his being *baptized*, deſiring him to *Suffer it to be ſo now*: Whereby he ſufficiently intimates, that he intended not thereby to *Perpetuate* it, as an *Ordinance* to his *Diſciples.* *Anſw.* Why *Chriſt* was *baptized* by *John.*

Secondly, They Object *Matth.* 28. 19. *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations*, baptizing *them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* Obj. 2.

This is the *great Objection*, and upon which they build the *Whole Superſtructure*: Whereunto the firſt general and ſound Anſwer *Anſw.*

ſwer is, by granting the whole; but putting them to prove, that *Water* is *here meant*, ſince the *Text* is *ſilent* of it. And though in reaſon it be ſufficient upon our part, that we *Concede* the *whole* expreſſed in the place, but deny, that it is by *Water*, which is an *Addition* to the *Text*; yet I ſhall premiſe ſome *Reaſons*, why we do ſo; and then conſider the *Reaſons* alledged by thoſe, that will have *Water* to be here underſtood.

What *Baptiſm Chriſt* doth mean in *Matth.* 28?

Arg. I. The *Firſt* is a Maxime yielded to by all, that

We ought not to go from the literal ſignification of the Text, except ſome urgent neceſſity force us thereunto.

But no *urgent Neceſſity* in this place *forceth* us *thereunto.*

Therefore we *ought not to go from it.*

Arg. II. *Secondly*, That *Baptiſm*, which Chriſt commanded his Apoſtles, was *the one* Baptiſm, *id eſt*, his *own Baptiſm.*

But the *one Baptiſm*, which is *Chriſt's Baptiſm*, is not with *Water* (as we have already proved.)

Therefore the *Baptiſm* commanded by Chriſt to his Apoſtles, was not *Water-baptiſm.*

Arg. III *Thirdly*: That *Baptiſm*, which Chriſt commanded his Apoſtles, was ſuch, that

that as many as were therewith *baptized*, did *put on Christ*.

But this is not true of *Water-baptism*.

Therefore, *&c.*

Fourthly: The *Baptism* commanded by Christ to his Apostles, was not *John*'s *Baptism*: Arg. IV.

But *Baptism* with *Water* was *John*'s *Baptism*:

Therefore, *&c.*

But *First*, They alledge, *That* Christ's Baptism, *though a* Baptism *with* Water, *did differ from* John's, *because* John *only baptized with* Water *unto* Repentance, *but Christ commands his Disciples to baptize in the Name of the* Father, Son, *and* Holy Ghost; *reckoning, that in this Form there lieth a great difference betwixt the* Baptism *of* John, *and that of* Christ. Allegat. I.

I Answer, as to that, *John*'s *Baptism* was unto *Repentance*, the *Difference* lieth not there, because so is *Christ*'s also. For our *Adversaries* will not deny, but that *Adult Persons*, that are *baptized*, ought, ere they be admitted to it, to *Repent* and *Confess* their Sins; yea, and that *Infants* with a respect to, and Consideration of their *Baptism*, ought to *Repent* and *Confess*: So that the *difference* lieth not here; since this of *Repentance* and *Confession* agrees as *Answ.*

well to *Christ's*, as to *John's Baptism*. But in this our *Adversaries* are divided: for *Calvin* will have *Christ's* and *John's* to be all one; *Inst. lib.* 4. cap. 15. Sect. 7, 8. Yet they do *differ*, and the *difference* is, in that the one is by *Water*, the other not, *&c.*

Secondly: As to what Christ saith, in commanding them to *baptize in the Name of the Father, Son and Spirit*, I confess that states the *Difference*, and it is great; but that lies not only in admitting *Water-baptism* in this different Form, by a bare expressing of these Words: For as the *Text* saith no such thing, neither do I see, how it can be inferred from it. For the *Greek* is εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, that is, *into the Name*; now the *Name* of the *Lord* is often taken in Scripture for something else, than a bare sound of Words, or *literal Expression*, even for his *Vertue* and *Power*, as may appear from *Psalm* 54. 3. *Cant.* 1. 3. *Prov.* 18. 10. and in many more. Now, that the Apostles were by their *Ministry* to *baptize* the *Nations into this Name*, *Vertue* and *Power*, and that they did so, is evident, by these *Testimonies* of *Paul* above mentioned, where he saith, That *as many of them, as were baptized into Christ, have put on Christ*: This must have been a *baptizing into*

Of the *Name* of the *Lord*, how taken in *Scripture*.

The *Baptism into the Name* what it is?

into the Name, i. e. *Power* and *Vertue*, and not a meer formal Expreſſion of Words adjoined with *Water-baptiſm*; becauſe, as hath been above obſerved, it doth not follow, as a *natural* or *neceſſary Conſequence* of it. I would have thoſe, who deſire to have their *Faith* built upon no other foundation, than the *Teſtimony* of *God's Spirit*, and *Scriptures* of *Truth*, throughly to Conſider, whether there can be any thing further alledged for this *Interpretation*, than what the prejudice of *Education* and influence of *Tradition* hath impoſed: Perhaps it may ſtumble the unwary and inconſiderate *Reader*, as if the very *Character* of *Chriſtianity* were aboliſhed, to tell him plainly, that this *Scripture* is not to be underſtood of *baptizing* with *Water*, and that this form of *baptizing* in the *Name* of *Father*, *Son* and *Spirit*, hath no warrant from *Matth.* 28. *&c.*

Whether *Chriſt* did preſcribe a *Form* of *Baptiſm* in *Matth.* 28.

For which, beſides the Reaſon taken from the *Signification* of [*the Name*] as being the *Vertue* and *Power* above expreſſed, let it be conſidered, that, if that had been a *Form preſcribed* by Chriſt to his Apoſtles, then ſurely, they would have made uſe of that *Form* in the adminiſtring of *Water-baptiſm* to ſuch as they *baptized* with *Water*; but though particular men-

tion be made in divers places of the *Acts*, *Who* were *baptized*, and *how?* and though it be particularly expreſſed, that they *baptized ſuch* and *ſuch*, as *Acts* 2. 41: 8. 12, 13, 38: 9. 18: 10. 48: 16. 15: 18. 8. yet there is not a Word of this *Form*. And in two places, *Acts* 8. 16: 19. 5. it is ſaid of ſome, that they were *baptized in the Name of the Lord Jeſus*; by which it yet more appears, that either the *Author* of this *Hiſtory* hath been very *defective*, who having ſo often occaſion to mention this, yet omitteth ſo *ſubſtantial a part* of *Baptiſm*, (which were to accuſe the *Holy Ghoſt*, by whoſe guidance *Luke* wrote it) or elſe that the Apoſtles did no ways underſtand, that Chriſt by his *Commiſſion* Matth. 28. did injoin them ſuch a *Form* of *Water-baptiſm*, ſeeing they did not uſe it. And therefore it is ſafer to conclude, that what they did in adminiſtring *Water-baptiſm*, they did not by vertue of that *Commiſſion*; elſe they would have ſo uſed it: For our *Adverſaries*, I ſuppoſe, would judge it a great *Hereſie* to Adminiſter *Water-baptiſm* without that, or only in the *Name* of *Jeſus*, without mention of *Father* or *Spirit*, as it is expreſly ſaid they did, in the two places above cited.

Alleg. II. *Secondly*, They ſay: *If this were not underſtood*

derstood of Water-baptism, *it would be a Tautology, and all one with* Teaching.

I say, *Nay: Baptizing* with the *Spirit* is somewhat further, than *Teaching* or *Informing* the *Understanding*; for it imports a *Reaching* to, and melting the *Heart*, whereby it is *turned*, as well as the *Understanding informed*. Besides, we find often in the Scripture, that *Teaching* and *Instructing* are put together without any *Absurdity* or needless *Tautology*; and yet these two have a greater *Affinity*, than *teaching* and *baptizing* with the *Spirit*. How *Teaching* and *Baptizing* differ.

Thirdly, They say; Baptism *in this Place must be understood with* Water, *because it is the Action of the* Apostles; *and so cannot be the* Baptism *of the* Spirit, *which is the Work of* Christ, *and his Grace, not of Man*, &c. Alleg. III.

I Answer: *Baptism* with the *Spirit*, though not wrought without *Christ* and his *Grace*, is Instrumentally done by Men, fitted of God for that purpose; and therefore no Absurdity follows, that *Baptism* with the *Spirit* should be expressed, as the *Action* of the *Apostles*: For though it be *Christ* by his *Grace*, that gives *Spiritual Gifts*, yet the Apostle, *Rom.* 1. 11. speaks of *his Imparting to them Spiritual Gifts*; and he tells the *Corinthians*, that he *had begot-* *Answ.* The *Baptism* with the *Spirit* ascribed to *Godly Men* as *Instruments.*

ten them through the Gospel, 1 Cor. 4. 15. And yet to beget *People* unto the *Faith,* is the *work* of *Christ* and his *Grace,* not of Men. To *Convert* the Heart is properly the *Work* of *Christ*; and yet the Scripture often-times ascribes it to *Men,* as being the *Instruments*: And since *Paul's Commission* was *to turn People from Darkness to Light,* though that be not done without Christ co-operating by his *Grace,* so may also *baptizing* with the *Spirit* be expressed, as performable by Man, as the *Instrument,* tho' the *Work* of *Christ's Grace* be needful to concur thereunto: So that it is no Absurdity to say, that the Apostles did Administer the *Baptism* of the *Spirit.*

Alleg. IV. *Lastly,* They say, *That since Christ saith here, that he will be with his Disciples to the end of the World, therefore* Water-baptism *must continue so long.*

Answ. If he had been speaking here of *Water-baptism,* then that might have been urged; but seeing that is denied, and proved to be *false,* nothing from thence can be gathered; He speaking of the *Baptism* of the *Spirit,* which we freely confess doth remain to the *End* of the *World,* yea, so long as *Christ's Presence* abideth with his *Children.*

Obj. III. § IX. *Thirdly,* They Object *the Constant*

ſtant Practice of the Apoſtles in the Primitive Church, who, they ſay, *did always Admini-*Water-baptiſm *to ſuch, as they Converted to the Faith of Chriſt; And hence alſo they further urge, that of* Matth. 28. *to have been meant of* Water, *or elſe the Apoſtles did not underſtand it, in that in* baptizing *they uſed* Water; *or that in ſo doing they walked without a Commiſſion.*

I Anſwer: That it was the *Conſtant Practice* of the *Apoſtles,* is denied; for we have ſhewn in the Example of *Paul,* that it was not ſo; ſince it were moſt abſurd to judge, that he *Converted* only thoſe *few,* even of the *Church* of *Corinth,* whom he ſaith he *baptized*; nor were it leſs abſurd to think, that that was a *conſtant Apoſtolick Practice,* which he, that was not Inferior to the *Chiefeſt* of the *Apoſtles,* and who declares, he laboured as much as they all, *rejoyceth,* he was ſo *little in.* But further, the *Concluſion* inferred from the *Apoſtles Practice* of *baptizing* with *Water,* to evince, that they underſtood *Matth.* 28. of *Water-baptiſm,* doth not hold: For though they *baptized* with *Water,* it will not follow, that either they did it by vertue of that *Commiſſion,* or that they miſtook that place; nor can there be any *Medium* brought, that will infer ſuch a *Concluſion.* How the Apoſtles Baptized.

As to the other insinuated Absurdity, *That they did it without a Commission*; It is none at all: For they might have done it by a *Permission*, as being in use, before *Christ's Death*; and because the People *nursed up* with *Outward Ceremonies*, could not be weaned wholly from them. And thus they used other things, as *Circumcision*, and *legal Purifications*, which yet they had no *Commission* from *Christ* to do. (to which we shall speak more at length in the following *Proposition* concerning the *Supper*.)

Object. But if from the *Sameness* of the *Word*, because *Christ bids them baptize*, and they afterwards in the *Use* of *Water* are said to *baptize*, it be judged probable, *that they did understand that Commission*, Matth. 28. *to authorize them to baptize with Water, and accordingly practised it.*

Answ. Although it should be granted, that for a *season* they did so far *mistake* it, as to judge, that *Water* belonged to that *Baptism*, (which however I find no necessity of granting) yet I see not any great Absurdity would thence follow. For it is plain, they did *mistake* that *Commission*, as to a main part of it, for a *Season*; as where he bids them, *Go teach all Nations*, since some time after they judged it unlawful to *Teach* the *Gentiles*: Yea, *Peter* himself scrupled

it,

it, until by a *Viſion conſtrained* thereunto; for which after he had done it, he was for a *ſeaſon* (until they were better informed) *judged* by the reſt of his *Brethren*. Now, if the *Education* of the *Apoſtles*, as *Jews*, and their Propenſity to adhere and ſtick to the *Jewiſh Religion*, did ſo far influence them, that even after *Chriſt's Reſurrection* and the *pouring forth* of the *Spirit*, they could not receive nor admit of the *Teaching* of the *Gentiles*, though Chriſt in his *Commiſſion* to them, commanded them to *Preach* to them; what further Abſurdity were it to ſuppoſe, that through the like *Miſtake* the *Chiefeſt* of them, having been the *Diſciples* of *John*, and his *Baptiſm* being ſo much prized there among the *Jews*, that they alſo took *Chriſt's Baptiſm*, intended by him of the *Spirit*, to be that of *Water*, which was *John's*, and accordingly practiſed it for a ſeaſon; it ſuffices us, that, if they were ſo *miſtaken* (though I ſay not, that they were ſo) they did not always remain under that *Miſtake*: Elſe *Peter* would not have ſaid of the *Baptiſm, which now ſaves, that it is not a putting away of the filth of the Fleſh*; which certainly *Water-baptiſm* is.

The Apoſtles did ſcruples the *Teaching* the *Gentils.*

But further they urge much *Peter's* baptiſing *Cornelius*: In which they preſs two things;

things; Firſt, *That Water-baptiſm is uſed even to thoſe, that had received the Spirit* Secondly, *That it is ſaid poſitively, he commanded them to be baptized,* Acts 10. 47, 48.

But neither of theſe doth neceſſarily infer *Water-baptiſm* to belong to the *New Covenant-Diſpenſation,* nor yet to be a *Perpetual ſtanding Ordinance* in the *Church.* For *Firſt,* All that this will amount to, was, That *Peter* at that time *baptized* theſe Men; but that he did it by vertue of that *Commiſſion, Matth.* 28. remains yet to be proved. And how doth the *baptiſing* with *Water,* after the *receiving* of the *Holy Ghoſt* prove the Caſe more, than the uſe of *Circumciſion* and other *Legal Rites* acknowledged to have been acted by him afterwards? Alſo no wonder, if *Peter,* that thought it ſo ſtrange (notwithſtanding all that had been profeſſed before, and ſpoken by *Chriſt*) that the *Gentiles* ſhould be made *Partakers* of the *Goſpel,* and with great difficulty, not without a very *extraordinary Impulſe* thereunto, was brought to come to them, and eat with them, was apt to put this *Ceremony* upon them; which being, as it were, the particular *Diſpenſation* of *John,* the *Fore-runner* of *Chriſt,* ſeemed to have greater *Affinity* with the *Goſpel,* than the other *Jewiſh Ceremonies*

Whether *Peter's Baptizing* ſome with *Water* makes it a *ſtanding Ordinance* to the *Church?*

remonies then uſed by the *Church*: but that will no ways infer our *Adverſaries Concluſion*. *Secondly*, As to theſe Words, *And he commanded them to be baptized*, it declareth matter of *Fact*, not of *Right*; and amounteth to no more, than that *Peter* did at that time *pro hic & nunc*, Command thoſe perſons to be *baptized* with *Water*; which is not denied: but it ſaith nothing, that *Peter* commanded *Water-baptiſm* to be a *Standing* and *Perpetual Ordinance* to the *Church*; neither can any Man of ſound Reaſon ſay (if he heed what he ſays) that a *Command* in matter of *Fact* to *Particular* Perſons, doth infer the thing commanded to be of *general* obligation to all, if it be not other ways bottomed upon ſome *Poſitive Precept*. Why doth *Peter*'s Commanding *Cornelius* and his *Houſhold* to be *baptized* at that time, infer *Water-baptiſm* to *Continue*, more than his *Conſtraining* (which is more than Commanding) the *Gentiles* in general to be *Circumciſed*, and obſerve the *Law*? We find, that at that time, when *Peter* baptized *Cornelius*, it was not determined, whether the *Gentiles* ſhould not be *Circumciſed*; but on the contrary, it was the moſt *general Senſe* of the *Church*, that *they ſhould*: And therefore no wonder, if they thought it need-

needful at that time, that they ſhould be *baptized*, which had more *Affinity* with the *Goſpel*, and was a Burthen leſs grievous.

Obj. IV. § X. *Fourthly*, They *Object* from the *Signification* of the *Word* [*baptize*] *which is as much as to* Dip *and* Waſh *with* Water, *alledging thence, that the very Word imports a being* baptized *with* Water.

Anſw. This *Objection* is very weak. For ſince *baptizing* with *Water* was a *Rite* among the *Jews*, as *Paulus Riccius* ſheweth, even before the coming of *John*; therefore that *Ceremony* received that Name from the *Nature* of the *Practice*, as uſed both by the *Jews* and by *John*. Yea we find, that Chriſt and his Apoſtles frequently make uſe of theſe *Terms* to a more *Spiritual Signification*: *Circumciſion* was only uſed and underſtood among the *Jews*, to be that of the *Fleſh*; but the Apoſtle tells us of the *Circumciſion of the Heart and Spirit, made without Hands*. So that, though *Baptiſm* was uſed among the *Jews*, only to ſignifie a *Waſhing* with *Water*, yet both *John*, *Chriſt*, and his *Apoſtles*, ſpeak of a being *baptized with the Spirit and with Fire*, which they make the *Peculiar Baptiſm* of *Chriſt*, as contradiſtinguiſhed from that of *Water*, which was *John*'s (as is above ſhewn.)

Baptizing ſignifies *Dipping* or *Waſhing* with *Water*.

So

So that, though *Baptiſm* among the *Jews* was only underſtood of *Water*, yet among *Chriſtians* it is very well underſtood of the *Spirit* without *Water*; as we ſee *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles ſpiritually* to *underſtand* things, under the *Terms* of what had been *Shadows* before. Thus *Chriſt* ſpeaking of his *Body*, (though the *Jews* miſtook him) ſaid, he would *Deſtroy* this *Temple, and build it again in three days*; and many more, that might be inſtanced. But if the *Etymology* of the Word ſhould be tenaciouſly adhered to, it would militate againſt moſt of our *Adverſaries*, as well as againſt us. For the *Greek* Βαπτίζω ſignifies *Immergo*, to *plunge* and *dip in*, and that was the proper uſe of *Water-baptiſm* among the *Jews*, and alſo by *John*, and the *Primitive Chriſtians*, who uſed it; whereas our *Adverſaries* for the moſt part only *Sprinkle* a little *Water* upon the *Forehead*, which doth not at all anſwer to the Word [*Baptiſm.*] Yea thoſe of old among *Chriſtians*, that uſed *Water-baptiſm*, thought this *dipping* and *plunging* ſo needful, that they thus *dipped Children*: And foraſmuch as it was judged, that it might prove hurtful to ſome weak Conſtitutions, *Sprinkling*, to prevent that hurt, was *introduced*; yet then it was likewiſe appointed, that ſuch, as were only *ſprinkled*,

Βαπτίζω *Immergo, intingo*, to *plunge* and *dip in*.

Thoſe that of old uſed *Water-baptiſm* were *dipt* and *plunged*; and thoſe that were only *ſprinkled*, were not admitted to any *Office* in the *Church*: and *why?*

led, and not *dipped*, should not be admit. to have any *Office* in the *Church*, as not being sufficiently *baptized*. So that, if our *Adversaries* will *stick* to the *Word*, they must alter their Method of *Sprinkling*.

Obj. V. *Fifthly*, They Object, *John* 3. 5. *Except a Man be born* again *of* Water *and of the* Spirit, *&c. hence inferring the necessity of* Water-baptism, *as well as of the* Spirit.

Answ. But if this prove any thing, it will prove *Water-baptism* to be of *absolute Necessity*: And therefore *Protestants* rightly affirm, when this is urged upon them by *Papists*, to evince the *absolute Necessity* of *Water-baptism*, that [*Water*] is not here understood of *Outward Water*; but mystically of an *Inward Cleansing* and *Washing*. Even as where Christs speaks of being *baptized with Fire*, it is not to be understood of *outward material Fire*, but only of Purifying, by a *Metonymy*; because to *purifie* is a proper *Effect* of *Fire*, as to *Wash* and *make clean* is of *Water*. Therefore the Scripture alludes to *Water*, where it can as little be so understood: As where we are said to be *Saved by the Washing of Regeneration*, Tit. 3. 5. Yea, *Peter* saith expressly in the place often cited, as *Calvin* well observes; That *the Baptism, which saves, is not the putting away of the filth of the Flesh*: So that, since [*Wa-*

The *Water* that *Regenerates*, is *Mystical* and *Inward*.

In the 4th. Book of his *Instit.* Chap. 15.

[*Water*] cannot be underſtood of *outward Water*, this can ſerve nothing to prove *Water-baptiſm*.

If it be *ſaid*, that [*Water*] *imports here* neceſſitatem Præcepti, *though not* Medii. Object.

I Anſwer; That is firſt to take it for granted, that *outward VVater* is here underſtood; the contrary whereof we have already proved. *Next*, *VVater* and the *Spirit* are placed here together, [*Except a Man be born of VVater and the Spirit*] where the *Neceſſity* of the one is urged, as much as of the other. Now if the *Spirit* be abſolutely *neceſſary*, ſo will alſo *Water*: And then we muſt either ſay, that *To be born of the Spirit*, is not abſolutely *neceſſary*, which all acknowledge to be *falſe*; or elſe that *Water* is abſolutely *neceſſary*, which, as *Proteſtants*, we affirm and have proved, is *falſe*: elſe we muſt confeſs, that *Water* is not here underſtood of *outward Water*. For to ſay, that when *Water* and the *Spirit* are placed here juſt together, and in the ſame manner, though there be not any *difference* or *ground* for it viſible in the *Text*, or deduceable from it, That the *neceſſity* of *Water* is here *Præcepti*, but not *Medii*, but the *neceſſity* of the *Spirit* is both *Medii* and *Præcepti*; is indeed confidently to affirm, but not to prove. *Anſw.* *Neceſſitas Præcepti* and *Medii*, urged.

Sixthly,

Obj. VI. *Sixthly*, and lastly, They *Object*; That the *Baptism of Water is a visible Sign or Badge, to distinguish Christians from* Infidels, *even as Circumcision did the* Jews.

Answ. I Answer; This saith nothing at all, unless it be proved to be a *necessary Precept*, or part of the *New Covenant-Dispensation*; it not being lawful to us to impose *outward Ceremonies* and *Rites*, and say, they will distinguish us from *Infidels*. *Circumcision* was positively commanded, and said to be a *Seal* of the *first Covenant*; but as we have already proved, that there is no such Command for *Baptism*, so there is not any Word in all the *New Testament*, calling it *a Badge* of *Christianity*, or *Seal* of the *New Covenant*: And therefore to conclude, it is so, because *Circumcision* was so, (unless some better Proof be alledged for it) is miserably to beg the Question. *The professing of Faith in Christ, and a holy Life answering thereunto, is a far better* Badge *of* Christianity, *than any outward Washing*; which yet answers not to that of *Circumcision*, since that affixed a *Character* in the *Flesh*, which this doth not: So that a *Christian* is not known to be a *Christian* by his being *baptized*, especially when he was a *Child*, unless he tell them so much. And may not the *Professing Faith* in *Christ* signifie that

Circumcision a *Seal* of the *first Covenant.*

Water-baptism falsly called a *Badge* of *Christianity.*

Which is the *Badge* of *Christianity?*

that as well? I know, there are divers of those, called *Fathers*, that speak much of *Water-baptism*, calling it *Character Christianitatis*; but so did they also of the *Sign* of the *Cross*, and other such things, justly rejected by *Protestants*. For the *Mystery* of *Iniquity*, which began to work even in the Apostles days, soon spoiled the Simplicity and Purity of the Christian Worship; so that not only many *Jewish* Rites were retained, but many Heathenish Customs and Ceremonies introduced into the Christian Worship; as particularly that Word [*Sacrament.*] So that it is great folly, especially for *Protestants*, to plead any thing of this from Tradition or Antiquity; for we find, that neither *Papists* nor *Protestants* use these Rites exactly, as the *Ancients* did, who in such things not walking by the most certain Rule of God's Spirit, but doting too much upon Outwards, were very Uncertain. For most of them all, in the Primitive Time did wholly Plunge and Dip those they Baptized; which neither *Papists* nor *Protestants* do: Yea, several of the *Fathers* accused some as *Hereticks* in their Days, for holding some Principles common with *Protestants*, concerning it; as particularly *Augustine* doth the *Pelagians*, for saying, That *In-*

What the *Fathers* say of *Water-baptism*, and of the *Sign* of the *Cross*.

Heathenish Ceremonies introduc'd into the *Christian Worship*.

fants dying Unbaptized, may be ſaved. And the *Manichees* were Condemned, for denying, that *Grace is univerſally given by Baptiſm*; and *Julian* the *Pelagian* by *Auguſtine*, for denying *Exorciſm and Inſufflation in the uſe of Baptiſm:* All which things *Proteſtants* deny alſo. So that *Proteſtants* do but fooliſhly to upbraid us, as if we could not ſhew any among the *Ancients*, that denied Water-baptiſm; ſeeing they cannot ſhew any, whom they acknowledge not to have been *Heretical* in ſeveral things, to have uſed it, nor yet, who uſing it, did not uſe alſo the *Sign* of the *Croſs*, and other things with it, which they deny. There were ſome nevertheleſs in the darkeſt Times of *Popery*, who teſtified againſt *Water-baptiſm*. For one *Alanus*, page 103, 104, 107. ſpeaks of ſome in his Time, that were burnt for the denying of it: For they ſaid, that *Baptiſm* had *no Efficacy either in Children or Adult Perſons; and therefore Men were not obliged to take Baptiſm:* Particularly *Ten Canonicks* (ſo called) *were burnt for that Crime, by the Order of King* Robert *of* France; as *P. Pithæus* tells in his *Fragments* of the *Hiſtory* of *Guienne*. Which is alſo confirmed by one *Johannes Floracenſis*, a *Monk* (who was famous at that Time) in

Exorciſm or Adjuration.

The *Sign of the Croſs.*

Many in *former Ages* teſtified againſt *Water-baptiſm.*

in his Epiſtle to *Oliva*, Abbot of the *Auſonian* Church: *I will* (ſaith he) *give you to underſtand concerning the* Hereſie, *that was in the* City *of* Orleans *on* Childer-maſs-day: *For it was true, if ye have heard any thing, that King* Robert *cauſed to be burnt alive nigh* Fourteen *of that* City, *of the* Chief *of their* Clergy, *and the more Noble of their* Laicks, *who were hateful to God, and abominable to Heaven and Earth; for they did ſtiffly deny the* Grace *of* Holy Baptiſm, *and alſo the Conſecration of our Lord's Body and Blood.* The Time of this Deed is noted in theſe Words by *Papir. Maſſon.* in his Annals of *France*, lib. 3. in *Hugh.* and *Robert*, *Actum Aureliæ publice Anno Incarnationis Domini* 1022. *Regni* Roberti *Regis* 28. *Indictione* 5. *quando* Stephanus *Hæreſiarcha & Complices ejus damnati ſunt & exuſti* Aureliæ.

Ten Canonicks burnt at *Orleans*, and why?

Now for their calling them *Heretick*s and *Manichees*, we have nothing but the Teſtimony of their Accuſers; which will no more invalidate their Teſtimony for this *Truth* againſt the uſe of *Water-baptiſm*, or give more ground to charge us, as being one with *Manichees*, than becauſe ſome, called by them *Manichees*, do agree with *Proteſtants* in ſome things, that therefore *Proteſtants* are *Manichees* or *Heretick*s:

which *Proteſtants* can no ways ſhun. For the Queſtion is, *Whether, in what they did, they walked according to the* Truth *teſtified of by the* Spirit *in the* Holy Scriptures? So that the Controverſie is brought back again to the Scriptures, according to which I ſuppoſe I have formerly diſcuſſed it.

The *Baptiſm* of *Infants* an Humane *Tradition.*

As for the latter part of the *Theſis*, denying the *Uſe* of *Infant-baptiſm*, it neceſſarily follows, from what is above-ſaid. For if *Water-baptiſm* be Ceaſed, then ſurely Baptizing of *Infants* is not warrantable. But thoſe that take upon them to Oppoſe us in this matter, will have more to do, as to this latter part: For after they have done, what they can, to prove *Water-baptiſm*; it remains for them to prove, that *Infants* ought to be Baptized. For he that proves *Water-baptiſm* Ceaſed, proves, that *Infant-baptiſm* is Vain: But he that ſhould prove, that *Water-baptiſm* continues, has not thence proved, that *Infant-baptiſm* is neceſſary; That needs ſomething further. And therefore it was a pitiful Subterfuge of *Nic. Arnoldus* againſt this, to ſay, That the denying of *Infant-baptiſm* belonged to the Gangrene of *Anabaptiſts*; without adding any further *Probation.*

Con-

Concerning the Communion *or* Participation *of the* Body *and* Blood *of* Christ.

The Communion *of the* Body *and* Blood *of* Christ *is* Inward *and* Spiritual, *which is the* Participation *of his* Flesh *and* Blood, *by which the* Inward Man *is daily nouriſhed in the Hearts of thoſe, in whom Chriſt dwells. Of which things the* Breaking *of* Bread *by Chriſt with his Diſciples was a* Figure; *which they even uſed in the Church for a time, who had received the* Subſtance, *for the ſake of the* Weak. *Even as* Abſtaining from things ſtrangled, *and* from Blood, the Waſhing one anothers Feet, *and the* Anointing of the Sick with Oil: *All which are commanded with no leſs Authority and Solemnity, than the former; yet ſeeing they are but the* Shadows *of better things, they* Ceaſe *in ſuch, as have obtained the* Subſtance.

1 Cor. 10. 16, 17. Joh. 6. 2, 33, 35. 1 Cor. 5. 8. Acts 15. 20. John 13. 14. Jam. 5. 14.

§ I. THE Communion of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, is a Myſtery hid from all natural men in their firſt,

fall'n and degenerate State; which they cannot underſtand, reach to, nor comprehend, as they there abide, neither as they there are, can they be Partakers of it, nor yet are they able to Diſcern the Lord's Body. And foraſmuch as the Chriſtian World (ſo called) for the moſt part hath been ſtill labouring, working, conceiving and imagining in their own natural and unrenewed Underſtandings about the things of God and Religion, therefore hath this Myſtery much been hid and ſealed up from them, while they have been contending, quarrelling and fighting one with another about the meer Shadow, Outſide and Form, but ſtrangers to the Subſtance, Life and Vertue.

The Body and Blood of Chriſt is Spiritual.

§ II. The Body then of Chriſt, which Believers partake of, is Spiritual, and not Carnal; and his Blood, which they drink of, is pure and Heavenly, and not humane or Elementary; as *Auguſtin* alſo affirms of the Body of Chriſt, which is Eaten, in his *Tractat*, Pſal. 98. *Except a Man eat my Fleſh, he hath not in him Life Eternal*: And he ſaith; 'The Words, which 'I ſpeak unto you, are Spirit and Life, 'underſtand ſpiritually what I have ſpo-'ken. Ye ſhall not eat of this Body, 'which ye ſee, and drink this Blood, 'which

'which they shall spill, that Crucifie me: 'I *am the Living Bread, which have descen-* 'ded *from Heaven*; he called himself the 'Bread, who descended from Heaven, ex- 'horting that we might believe in him, '*&c.*

If it be asked then, What that Body, What that Flesh and Blood is? *Quest.*

I Answer: It is that Heavenly Seed, that Divine, Spiritual, Cœlestial Substance, of which we spake before in the 5th and 6th Propositions. This is that *Vehiculum Dei*, or Spiritual Body of Christ, whereby and where-through he communicateth Life to Men, and *Salvation to as many as believe in him*, and *receive him*; and whereby also Man comes to have Fellowship and Communion with God. This is proved from the 6th of *John*, from *verse* 32. to the end, where Christ speaks more at large of this matter, than in any other place: And indeed, this Evangelist and beloved Disciple, who lay in the Bosom of our Lord, gives us a more full account of the Spiritual Sayings and Doctrine of Christ: And it's observable, that though he speaks nothing of the Ceremony used by Christ, of Breaking Bread with his Disciples, neither in his Evangelical Account of Christ's Life and Sufferings, *Answ.*

What the heavenly Seed is, whereby formerly and also now Life and Salvation was and is Communicated.

nor in his Epiſtles; yet he is more large in this account of the Participation of the Body, Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, than any of them all. For Chriſt in this Chapter perceiving, that the *Jews* did follow him for Love of the Loaves, deſires them (*ver.* 27.) to *labour not for the Meat which periſheth*, but *for that Meat which endureth for ever*: But foraſmuch as they, being Carnal in their Apprehenſions, and not underſtanding the Spiritual Language and Doctrine of Chriſt, did judge the *Manna*, which *Moſes* gave their Fathers, to be the moſt Excellent Bread, as coming from Heaven; Chriſt, to rectifie that miſtake, and better inform them, affirmeth *Firſt*, That it is not *Moſes*, *but his Father*, *that giveth the true Bread from Heaven*, ver. 32. and 48. *Secondly*, This Bread he calls himſelf, *ver.* 35. *I am the Bread of Life*: And *ver.* 51. *I am the living Bread*, *which came down from Heaven*: *Thirdly*, He declares, that this Bread is his Fleſh, *ver.* 51. *The Bread*, *that I will give*, *is my Fleſh*: And *ver.* 55. *For my Fleſh is Meat indeed*, *and my Blood is drink indeed*: *Fourthly*, The Neceſſity of partaking thereof, *ver.* 53. *Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man*, *and drink his Blood*, *ye have no Life in you*: And laſtly, *ver.* 33. the bleſſed Fruits and neceſſary

The *Origine*, *Nature* and *Effects* of the *Body*, *Fleſh* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*.

ceſſary Effects of this Communion of the Body and Blood of Chriſt; *This Bread giveth Life to the World*, ver. 50. *He that eateth thereof dyeth not*; ver. 58. *He, that eateth of this Bread, ſhall live for ever*, ver. 51. *Whoſo eateth this Fleſh, and drinketh this Blood, ſhall live for ever*, ver. 54. *And he dwelleth in Chriſt, and Chriſt in him*; ver. 56. *And ſhall live by Chriſt*; ver. 57. From this large Deſcription of the *Origine*, Nature and Effects of this Body, Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, it is apparent, that it is Spiritual, and to be underſtood of a Spiritual Body, and not of that Body or Temple of Jeſus Chriſt, which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and in which he walked, lived and ſuffered in the Land of *Judea*; becauſe that it is ſaid, both that it *came down from Heaven*, yea, that it is *He, that came down from Heaven*. Now all Chriſtians at preſent generally acknowledge, that the outward Body of Chriſt came not down from Heaven, neither was it that part of Chriſt, which *came down from Heaven*. And to put the matter out of doubt, when the Carnal *Jews* would have been ſo underſtanding it, he tells them plainly, *ver. 63. It is the Spirit, that quickeneth, but the Fleſh profiteth nothing*. This is alſo founded upon moſt ſound and ſolid Reaſon;

Solid *Reasons*, that it is His *Spiritual Body*, Christ ſpeaks of.

ſon; becauſe that it is the Soul, not the Body, that is to be nouriſhed by this Fleſh and Blood. Now outward Fleſh cannot nouriſh nor feed the Soul; there is no proportion, nor Analogy betwixt them; neither is the Communion of the Saints with God by a Conjunction and mutual Partici-

1 Cor. 6. 17. pation of Fleſh, but of the Spirit: *He that is joined to the Lord, is One Spirit*, not one Fleſh. For the Fleſh (I mean outward Fleſh, even ſuch as was that, wherein Chriſt lived and walked, when upon Earth; and not Fleſh, when tranſpoſed by a Metaphor, to be underſtood Spiritually) can only partake of Fleſh, as Spirit of Spirit: As the Body cannot feed upon Spirit, neither can the Spirit feed upon Fleſh. And that the Fleſh here ſpoken of, is ſpiritually underſtood, appears further, in that, that which feedeth upon it, ſhall never dye: But the Bodies of all Men once dye, yea it behoved the Body of Chriſt himſelf to dye. That this Body and Spiritual Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt is to be underſtood of that Divine and Heavenly Seed before ſpoken of by us, appears both by the Nature and Fruits of it. *Firſt*, It's ſaid, *It is that, which cometh down from Heaven, and giveth Life unto the World:* Now, this anſwers to that Light and Seed, which

is

is testified of, *John* 1. to be the Light of the World, and the Life of Men. For that Spiritual Light and Seed, as it receives place in mens Hearts, and room to spring up there, is as Bread to the hungry and fainting Soul, that is (as it were) buried and dead in the lusts of the World, which receives Life again; and revives, as it tasteth and partaketh of this heavenly Bread: And they that partake of it, are said to come to Christ; neither can any have it, but by coming to him, and believing in the appearance of his Light in their Hearts; by receiving which, and believing in it, the Participation of this Body and Bread is known. And that Christ understands the same thing here by his Body, Flesh and Blood, which is understood *John* 1. by the Light inlightening every Man, and the Life, *&c.* appears, for the Light and Life spoken of *John* 1. is said to be Christ; *He is the true Light*: and the Bread and Flesh, *&c.* spoken of in this 6th of *John*, is called Christ; *I am the Bread of Life*, saith he. Again, *They that received that Light and Life*, John 1. 12. *Obtained Power to become the Sons of God, by believing in his Name*: So also here, *John* 6. 35. *He that cometh unto this Bread of Life shall not Hunger; and he that believes in him, who*

The Spiritual *Light* and *Seed* is as *Bread* to the Hungry *Soul.*

is

is this Bread ſhall never thirſt. So then, as there was the outward viſible Body and Temple of Jeſus Chriſt, which took its Original from the Virgin *Mary*; ſo there is alſo the Spiritual Body of Chriſt, by and through which He, that was the Word in the beginning with God, and was and is GOD, did Reveal himſelf to the Sons of Men in all Ages, and whereby Men in all Ages come to be made partakers of Eternal Life, and to have Communion and Fellowſhip with God and Chriſt. Of which Body of Chriſt, and Fleſh and Blood, if both *Adam*, and *Seth*, and *Enoch*, and *Abraham*, and *Moſes*, and *David*, and all the Prophets and Holy Men of God had not eaten, they had not had Life in them, nor could their inward Man have been nouriſhed. Now, as the outward Body and Temple was called Chriſt, ſo was alſo this Spiritual Body no leſs properly, and that long before that outward Body was in Being. Hence the Apoſtle ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 10. 3, 4. That the *Fathers did all eat the ſame ſpiritual Meat, and did all drink the ſame ſpiritual Drink: (for they drank of that Spiritual Rock, that followed them; and that Rock was Chriſt.)* This cannot be underſtood otherwiſe than of this Spiritual Body of Chriſt: Which Spiritual

Chriſt's *Outward* and *Spiritual Body* diſtinguiſhed.

The *Patriarchs* did eat of the *Body*, and *Fleſh* and *Blood* of Chriſt.

ritual Body of Chriſt, though it was the ſaving Food of the Righteous both before the Law, and under the Law, yet under the Law it was vailed and ſhadowed, and covered under divers Types, Ceremonies and Obſervations; yea and not only ſo, but it was vailed and hid, in ſome reſpect, under the outward Temple and Body of Chriſt, or during the continuance of it; ſo that the *Jews* could not underſtand Chriſt's Preaching about it, while on Earth: And not the *Jews* only, but many of his Diſciples judged it an *hard ſaying, murmured at it, and many from that time went back from him, and walked no more with him.* I doubt not, but there are many alſo at this day profeſſing to be Diſciples of Chriſt, that do as little underſtand this matter, as thoſe did, and are as apt to be offended and ſtumble at it, while they are gazing and following after the outward Body; and look not to that, by which the Saints are daily fed and nouriſhed. For as Jeſus Chriſt, in obedience to the Will of the Father, did by the Eternal Spirit offer up that Body for a Propitiation for the Remiſſion of Sins, and finiſhed his Teſtimony upon Earth thereby, in a moſt perfect Example of Patience, Reſignation and Holineſs, that all might be made

Joh. 6. 60, 66.

made Partakers of the Fruit of that Sacrifice; ſo hath he likewiſe poured forth into the Hearts of all Men a meaſure of that Divine Light and Seed, wherewith he is Cloathed, that thereby reaching unto the Conſciences of all, he may Raiſe them up out of Death and Darkneſs by his Life and Light; and they thereby may be made Partakers of his Body, and therethrough come to have Fellowſhip with the Father and with the Son.

The Divine Light of Chriſt doth make the Saints Partakers of his Body.

Queſt. § III. If it be asked, How and after what manner Man comes to partake of it, and to be fed by it?

Anſw. I Anſwer in the plain and expreſs words of Chriſt; *I am the Bread of Life* (ſaith he) *he that cometh to me, ſhall never hungeh; he that believeth in me, ſhall never thirſt*: And again; *For my Fleſh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed.* So whoſoever thou art, that askeſt this Queſtion, or read'ſt theſe Lines, whether thou account'ſt thy ſelf a *Believer*, or really feeleſt by a certain and ſad Experience, that thou art yet in the Unbelief, and find'ſt, that the outward *Body* and Fleſh of Chriſt is ſo far from thee, that thou canſt not reach it, nor feed upon it: Yea, though thou haſt often ſwallowed down and taken in that which the *Papiſts* have

Joh. 6. 35. and 55.

per-

perſwaded thee to be the Real Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, and haſt believed it to be ſo; though all thy Senſes told thee the Contrary: Or (being a *Lutheran*) haſt taken that Bread, in and with, and under which the *Lutherans* have aſſured thee that the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt is: Or (being a *Calviniſt*) haſt partaken of that, which the *Calviniſts* ſay (though a Figure only of the Body) gives them that take it, a Real Participation of the Body, Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, though they neither know how, nor what way; I ſay, if for all this, thou find'ſt thy Soul yet barren, yea hungry, and ready to ſtarve for want of ſomething thou longeſt for; know, that that Light that diſcovers thy Iniquity to thee, that ſhews thee thy Barrenneſs, thy Nakedneſs, thy Emptineſs, is that Body, that thou muſt partake of, and feed upon: But that till by forſaking Iniquity thou turn'ſt to it, com'ſt unto it, receiv'ſt it, though thou may'ſt hunger after it, thou canſt not be Satisfied with it; for it hath no Communion with Darkneſs: *Nor canſt thou drink of the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils, and be Partaker of the Lord's Table, and the Table of Devils*, 1 Cor. 10. 21? But as thou ſuffer'ſt that ſmall Seed of Righte-

The *Lutherans* and *Calvinians* Opinion of the *Fleſh* and *Blood* of Chriſt in the *Supper* (ſo called.)

2 Cor. 6. 14.

How the *Inward Man* is nouriſht.

Righteouſneſs to ariſe in thee, and to be formed into a Birth, that New Subſtantial Birth, that's brought forth in the Soul, naturally feeds upon, and is nouriſhed by this Spiritual Body: Yea, as this outward Birth lives not, but as it ſucks in Breath by the Outward Elementary Air; ſo this New Birth lives not in the Soul, but as it draws in and breathes by that Spiritual Air or Vehicle: And as the Outward Birth cannot ſubſiſt without ſome Outward Body to feed upon, ſome Outward Fleſh, and ſome outward Drink; ſo neither can this Inward Birth, without it be fed by this Inward Body, by this Inward Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, which anſwers to it after the ſame manner, by way of *Analogy*. And this is moſt agreeable to the Doctrine of Chriſt concerning this matter. For as without Outward Food the Natural Body hath not Life; ſo alſo ſaith Chriſt,

Joh. 6.53. *Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*: And as the Outward body eating Outward food,

Joh. 6.57. lives thereby; ſo Chriſt ſaith, *That he that eateth him, ſhall live by him.* So it is this Inward Participation of this Inward Man, of this Inward and Spiritual Body, by which Man is united to God, and has Fellowſhip and Communion with him.

He,

He that eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood (saith Christ) *dwelleth in me, and I in him*; this cannot be understood of Outward Eating of Outward Bread: And as by this the Soul must have Fellowship with God, so also in so far as all the Saints are Partakers of this One Body, and this One Blood, they come also to have a Joint-Communion. Hence the Apostle 1 *Cor.* 10. 17. in this respect saith, That they *being many, are One Bread, and One Body:* And to the Wise among the *Corinthians* he saith, *The Bread, which we break, is the Communion of the Body of Christ.* This is the True and Spiritual Supper of the Lord, which Men come to partake of by hearing the Voice of Christ, and opening the Door of their Hearts, and so letting him in, in the manner above-said, according to the plain words of the Scripture, *Rev.* 3. 20. *Behold, I stand at the Door and Knock; if any Man hear my Voice, and open the Door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.* So that the Supper of the Lord, and the Supping with the Lord, and partaking of his Flesh and Blood, is no ways limited to the Ceremony of breaking Bread and drinking Wine at particular times; but is truly and really Enjoyed, as often as the Soul retires into

Joh. 6. 56.

Ver. 16.

The *True Spiritual Supper* of the *Lord.*

the Light of the Lord, and feels and partakes of that Heavenly Life, by which the Inward Man is nouriſhed: Which may be, and is often witneſſed by the Faithful at all times; though more particularly, when they are Aſſembled together to Wait upon the Lord.

§ IV. But what Confuſion the Profeſſors of Chriſtianity have run into concerning this matter, is more than obvious; who (as in moſt other things they have done) for want of a true Spiritual Underſtanding, have ſought to Tie this Supper of the Lord to that Ceremony (uſed by Chriſt before his Death) of breaking Bread and drinking Wine with his Diſciples. And though they for the moſt part agree in this general, yet how do they Contend and Debate one againſt another? How ſtrangely are they pinched, pained, and ſtraitned to make this Spiritual Myſtery agree to that Ceremony? And what monſtrous and wild Opinions and Conceivings have they invented, to incloſe or affix the Body of Chriſt to their Bread and Wine? From which Opinion not only the greateſt, and fierceſt, and moſt hurtful Conteſts, both among the Profeſſors of Chriſtianity in general, and among Proteſtants in particular, have ariſen; but alſo ſuch

Man is not tied to the *Ceremony* of *breaking Bread* and *drinking Wine*, which Chriſt did uſe with his Diſciples; This only was a *Shadow*.

such Absurdities, irrational and blasphemous Consequences have ensued, as make the Christian Religion odious and hateful to *Jews, Turks* and *Heathens*. The Professors of Christianity do chiefly divide in this matter into three Opinions.

What makes the *Christian Religion hateful to Jews, Turks* and *Heathens*?

The *first* is of those that say, *The Substance of the Bread is* Transubstantiated *into the very Substance of that same Body, Flesh and Blood of Christ, which was born of the Virgin* Mary, *and crucified by the* Jews: So that after the Words of Consecration (as they call them) *it is no more Bread, but the Body of Christ.*

The *Papists* Faith of *Christ* his *Flesh* and *Blood*

The *second* is of such as say; *The Substance of the Bread remains; but that also that Body is* in, *and* with, *and* under *the Bread*: So that *both the Substance of the Bread, and the Body, Flesh and Blood of Christ, is there also.*

The *Lutherans* Faith.

The *third* is of those, that (denying both these) do affirm, *That the Body of Christ is not there Corporally, or Substantially; but yet that it is Really and Sacramentally received by the Faithful, in the use of Bread and Wine*: But how, or what way it's there, *they know not, nor can they tell; only we must believe it is there, yet so, that it is only properly in Heaven.*

The *Calvinists* Faith.

It is not my Design to enter into a Refu-

tation of these several Opinions, for each of their Authors and Assertors have sufficiently Refuted one another; and are all of them no less strong both from Scripture and Reason, in Refuting each their contrary Party's Opinion, than they are Weak in Establishing their own. For I often have seriously observed in reading their respective Writings (and so it may be have others) that all of them do notably, in so far as they Refute the contrary Opinions; but that they are mightily pained, when they come to Confirm and Plead for their own: Hence I necessarily must conclude, That none of them had attained to the Truth and Substance of this Mystery. Let us see, if *Calvin*, after he hath Refuted the two former Opinions, be more successful, in what he affirms and asserts for the Truth of his Opinion; who, after he hath much laboured in overturning and Refuting the two former Opinions, plainly confesseth, that he *knows not, what to affirm instead of them.* For after he has spoken much, and at last Concluded, *That the Body of Christ is there, and that the Saints must needs partake thereof*; at last he lands in these Words. (*Sect.* 32.) *But if it be asked me, how it is? I shall not be ashamed to confess, That it is a Secret, too high for*

Inst. lib. 4 cap 17.

Calvin's Faith of Christ his *Flesh* and *Blood* Uncertain.

for me to comprehend in my Spirit, or explain in Words. Here he deals very ingeniouſly; and yet who would have thought, that ſuch a Man would have been brought to this Strait in the Confirming of his Opinion? Conſidering but a little before, in the ſame Chapter (*Sect.* 15.) he accuſeth the Schoolmen among the *Papiſts*, (and I Confeſs truly) *In that they neither Underſtand, nor Explain to others, how Chriſt is in the Euchariſt*; which ſhortly after he Confeſſeth himſelf, he cannot do. If then the School-men among the *Papiſts* do neither Underſtand, nor yet can Explain to others their Doctrine in this matter, nor *Calvin* can comprehend it in his Spirit, (which I judge is as much, as not to underſtand it) nor Expreſs it in Words (and then ſurely he cannot Explain it to others) then no certainty is to be had from either of them. There have been great Endeavours uſed for Reconcilement in this matter, both betwixt *Papiſts* and *Lutherans*, *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts*, yea, and *Calviniſts* and *Papiſts*, but all to no purpoſe: and many Forms and Manners of Expreſſions drawn up, to which all might yield; which in the end proved in vain, ſeeing every one underſtood them, and interpreted them, their own way: and ſo

The like the *Papiſts*.

they did thereby but Equivocate and Deceive one another. The Reason of all this Contention is, because they all wanted a clear Understanding of the Mystery, and were doting about the Shadow and the Externals. For both the Ground and Matter of their Contest lies in things extrinsick from, and unnecessary to the main Matter; and this hath been often the Policy of Satan to busie People, and amuse them with outward Signs, Shadows and Forms, making them Contend about that; while in the mean time the Substance is neglected. Yea, and in Contending for these Shadows, he stirs them up to the practice of Malice, Heat, Revenge and other Vices, by which he establisheth his Kingdom of Darkness among them, and ruines the Life of Christianity: For there has been more Animosity and Heat about this one Particular, and more Blood-shed and Contention, than about any other. And surely, they are little acquainted with the State of Protestants Affairs, who know not, that their Contentions about this have been more hurtful to the Reformation, than all the Opposition they met with from their common Adversaries. Now all these uncertain and absurd Opinions, and the Contentions therefrom arising, have pro-

Satan busies people in outward Sign, Shadows and Forms, whilst they neglect the Substance.

What hath been hurtful to the Reformation.

proceeded from their all agreeing in Two General Errors concerning this thing: Which being denied and receded from, as they are by us, there would be an Easie Way made for Reconciliation, and we should all meet in the one Spiritual and true Understanding of this Mystery; and as the Contentions, so would also the Absurdities, which follow from all the Three forementioned Opinions, Cease and fall to the ground.

Two Errors the ground of the *Contentions* about the *Supper.*

The *First* of these *Errors* is, in making the Communion or Participation of the Body, Flesh and Blood of Christ to relate to that outward Body, Vessel or Temple, that was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and walked and suffered in *Judea*; whereas it should relate to the Spiritual Body, Flesh and Blood of Christ, even that Heavenly and Celestial Light and Life, which was the Food and Nourishment of the Regenerate in all Ages, as we have already proved.

The *Second Error* is, In tying this Participation of the Body and Blood of Christ to that Ceremony, used by him with his Disciples in the breaking of bread, *&c.* as if it had only a Relation thereto, or, were only enjoyed in the use of that Ceremony; which it neither hath, nor is. For this is

that Bread, which Christ in his Prayer teaches to call for, terming it ἄρτον ἐπιούσιον, i. e. the supersubstantial Bread, as the *Greek* hath it; and which the Soul partakes of, without any relation or necessary respect to this Ceremony, as shall be hereafter proved more at length.

Believers Souls do really *feed* upon the *Flesh* and *Blood* of Christ.

These *Two Errors* being thus laid aside, and the Contentions arising therefrom buried, all are agreed in the main Positions, *viz. First*, That *the body, flesh and blood of Christ is necessary for the nourishing of the Soul*: *Secondly*, That *the Souls of Believers do really and truly partake and feed upon the body, flesh and blood of Christ.* But while Men are not content with the Spirituality of this Mystery, going in their own Wills, and according to their own Inventions, to strain and wrest the Scriptures, for to tie this Spiritual Communion of the flesh and blood of Christ, to outward Bread and Wine, and such like Carnal Ordinances, no wonder, if by their carnal Apprehensions they run into Heaps and Confusion. But because it hath been generally supposed, that the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ had some special relation to the Ceremony of breaking Bread, I shall first Refute that Opinion, and then proceed to consider the *Nature*

ture and *Use* of that *Ceremony*, and whether it be now *necessary to Continue*; answering the *Reasons* and *Objections* of such as plead its *Continuance*, as a necessary and standing *Ordinance* of *Jesus Christ*.

§ V. *First*, It must be understood, that I speak of a *Necessary* and *Peculiar Relation*, otherwise than in a *general Respect*: For, forasmuch as our *Communion* with *Christ* is, and ought to be, our greatest and chiefest Work, we ought to do all other things with a *Respect* to *God*, and our *Fellowship* with him; but a *special* and *necessary Respect* or Relation is such, as where the two things are tied and united together, either of their own *Nature*, or by the *Command* of *God*, that the one cannot be enjoyed, or at least is not (except very extraordinarily) without the other. Thus *Salvation* hath a necessary respect to *Holiness*, because *without Holiness no Man shall see God*: And the *Eating of the flesh and blood of* Christ hath a necessary respect to our having *Life*, because if we eat not his *flesh*, and drink not his *blood*, we cannot have *Life*: And our *Feeling of* God's *Presence* hath a necessary respect to our being found *Meeting in his Name*, by Divine Precept, because he has promised, *Where two or three are Met together in his Name*,

I. That the *Communion* of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* has no *special Relation* to the Ceremony of *breaking Bread*, neither by *Nature*, nor *Precept*.

Name, he will be in the midſt of them: In like manner our receiving *benefits* and *bleſſings from God*, has a neceſſary reſpect to our *Praying*, becauſe if we *Ask, he hath promiſed we ſhall Receive.* Now the *Communion* or *Participation* of the *fleſh* and *blood* of *Chriſt* hath no ſuch neceſſary relation to the *breaking* of *Bread* and *drinking* of *Wine*; for if it had any ſuch neceſſary relation, it would either be from the *Nature* of the *Thing*, or from ſome *Divine Precept:* But we ſhall ſhew, it is from neither; Therefore, *&c. Firſt*, It is not from the *Nature* of it, becauſe to partake of the *fleſh* and *blood* of Chriſt is a *Spiritual Exerciſe*; and all confeſs, that it is by the *Soul* and *Spirit*, that we become real *Partakers* of it, as it is the *Soul*, and not the *Body*, that is nouriſhed by it: but to *eat Bread* and *drink Wine*, is a natural Act, which in it ſelf adds nothing to the *Soul*, neither has any thing, that is *Spiritual*, in it; becauſe the *moſt carnal Man* that is, can as fully, as perfectly and as wholly *eat Bread* and *drink Wine*, as the *moſt Spiritual. Secondly*, Their relation is not by *Nature*, elſe they would infer one another: but all acknowledge, that many *eat* of the *Bread*, and *drink* of the *Wine*, even that which, they ſay, is *Conſecrate* and

Tran-

Transubstantiate into the very Body of Christ, who notwithstanding have not *Life Eternal*, have not Christ *dwelling* in *them*, nor do *live by him*, as all do, who truly partake of the *Flesh* and *Blood* of Christ, *without the Use of this Ceremony*; as all the *Patriarchs* and *Prophets* did, before this *Ordinance* (as they account it) was Instituted. Neither was there any thing under the *Law*, that had any direct or necessary Relation hereunto; though to *partake* of the *Flesh* and *Blood* of Christ in all Ages was indispensibly necessary to *Salvation*. For as for the *Paschal Lamb*, the whole *End* of it is signified particularly *Exod.* 13. 8, 9. to wit, that *the* Jews *might thereby be kept in remembrance of their deliverance out of* Egypt. *Secondly*, It has no relation by *Divine Precept*; for if it had, it would be mentioned in that, which our *Adversaries* account the *Institution* of it, or else in the *Practice* of it by the *Saints* recorded in *Scripture*: But so it is not. For as to the *Institution*, or rather *Narration* of *Christ's Practice* in this matter, we have it recorded by the Evangelists *Matthew*, *Mark* and *Luke*. In the *first two* there is only an Account of the matter of *Fact*, to wit, *That Christ brake Bread, and gave it his Disciples to eat, saying*,

The *Patriarchs* and *Prophets* without this *Ceremony's* Use were true *Partakers* of *Christ's Flesh* and *Blood*.

The *Paschal Lamb* its *End*.

Matth. 26. 26.

Mark 14. 22. Luke 22. 19. *ing, This is my Body; and bleſſing the Cup, he gave it them to drink, ſaying, This is my Blood*; but nothing of any deſire to them to do it. In the *laſt*, after the *Bread* (but before the *Bleſſing* or giving them the *Wine*) he bids them *do it in Remembrance of him*: What we are to think of this *Practice* of *Chriſt*, ſhall be ſpoken of hereafter. But what neceſſary Relation hath all this to the *Believers partaking* of the *Fleſh* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*? The *End* of this, for which they were to do it (if at all) is to *Remember Chriſt*; which the Apoſtle yet more particularly expreſſes, 1 *Cor.* 11. 26. *To ſhew forth the Lord's Death*: But to *Remember the Lord*, or *Declare his Death*, which are the ſpecial and particular *Ends* annexed to the Uſe of this *Ceremony*, is not at all to *partake* of the *Fleſh* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*, neither have they any more neceſſary Relation to it, than any other two different *Spiritual Duties*. For though they, that *partake* of the *Fleſh* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*, cannot but *Remember him*; yet the *Lord* and his *Death* may be *Remembred* (as none can deny) where his *Fleſh* and *Blood* is not truly *partaken* of. So that, ſince the very particular and expreſs *End* of this *Ceremony* may be witneſſed (to wit, the *Remembrance*

The *Inſtitution* of the *Supper*, or *Narration* of *Chriſt's Practice* therein.

brance of the *Lord's Death*) and yet the *Flesh* and *Blood* of *Christ* not *partaken* of, it cannot have had any *necessary Relation* to it, else the *partaking* thereof would have been the *End* of it, and could not have been attained without this *Participation.* But on the contrary we may well infer hence, that since the *positive End* of this *Ceremony* is not the *partaking* of the *Flesh* and *Blood of Christ*, and that whoever *partakes* of the *Flesh* and *Blood of Christ*, cannot but *Remember him*; that therefore such need not this *Ceremony* to put them in *Remembrance* of him.

But if it be said, *That Jesus Christ calls the Bread here his* Body, *and the Wine his* Blood; *therefore he seems to have had a special relation to his Disciples partaking of his* Flesh *and* Blood *in the use of this thing.* Object.

I *Answer*; His calling the *Bread* his *Body*, and the *Wine* his *Blood*, would yet infer no such thing: Though it is not denied, but that *Jesus Christ* in all things he did, yea and from the use of all *Natural things*, took occasion to raise the Minds of his *Disciples* and *Hearers* to *Spirituals.* Hence from the Woman of *Samaria* her drawing *Water*, he took occasion to tell her of that *Living Water*, which *whoso drinketh thereof, shall never thirst*; which *Answ.* The *Woman of Samaria.* Joh. 4. 14.

which indeed is all one with his *Blood* here ſpoken of: Yet it will not follow, that that *Well*, or *Water*, had any neceſſary relation to the *Living Water*, or the *Living Water* to it, *&c.* So Chriſt takes occaſion from the *Jews following* him for the *Loaves*, to tell them of this *Spiritual Bread and Fleſh of his Body*, which was more neceſſary for them to *feed* upon; it will not therefore follow, that their *following* him for the *Loaves* had any neceſſary relation thereunto. So alſo Chriſt here being at *Supper* with his *Diſciples*, takes occaſion from the *Bread* and *Wine*, which was before them, to ſignifie unto them, that as *That Bread*, which he *brake* unto them, and *That Wine*, which he *bleſſed* and *gave* unto them, did contribute to the *preſerving* and *nouriſhing* of their *Bodies*; ſo was he alſo to give his *Body*, and ſhed his *Blood* for the *Salvation* of their *Souls*: And therefore the very *End* propoſed in *this Ceremony*, to thoſe that obſerve it, is to be a *Memorial* of his *Death*.

The *Well*, the *Loaves* the *Bread* and *Wine*, Chriſt takes occaſion from, to ſhew the *Inward Feeding*.

But if it be ſaid, that the Apoſtle 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *Calls the* Bread *which he brake, the Communion of the Body of Chriſt, and the* Cup, *the Communion of his* Blood.

I do moſt willingly ſubſcribe unto it; but

but do deny, that this is understood of the *outward Bread*, neither can it be evinced, but the Contrary is manifest from the *Context*: For the Apostle in this *Chapter* speaks not one Word of that *Ceremony*. For having in the beginning of it shewn them, how the *Jews* of *Old* were made *partakers* of the *Spiritual Food* and *Water*, which was *Christ*, and how several of them, through *Disobedience* and *Idolatry* fell from that good Condition, he exhorts them by the *Example* of those *Jews*, whom God destroyed of Old, to *flee* those *Evils*; shewing them, that they (to wit, the *Corinthians*) are likewise *partakers* of the *body and blood of Christ*, of which *Communion* they would *rob* themselves, if they did *Evil, because they could not drink of the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils, and partake of the Lord's Table, and of the Table of Devils*, ver. 21. Which shews, that he understands not here the using of *outward Bread and Wine*; because those, that do *Drink* the *Cup of Devils*, and *Eat* of the *Table of Devils*, (yea, the *Wickedest* of Men) may partake of the *outward Bread* and *outward Wine*. For there the Apostle calls the *bread One*, ver. 17. and he saith, *We being many, are* One *bread and one body*; *for we*

The *wickedest* may take the *outward Bread* and *Wine*.

we are all partakers of that One *bread*: Now if the *bread* be *One*, it cannot be the *Outward*, or the *Inward* would be excluded; whereas it cannot be denied, but that it's the partaking of the *Inward bread*, and not the *Outward*, that makes the *Saints* truly *One body* and *One bread*. And whereas they ſay, that the *One bread* here comprehendeth both the *Outward and Inward by vertue of the Sacramental Union*; that indeed is to affirm, but not to prove. As for that *Figment* of a *Sacramental Union*, I find not ſuch a thing in all the Scripture, eſpecially in the *New Teſtament*: Nor is there any thing can give a riſe for ſuch a thing in this *Chapter*, where the Apoſtle, as is above obſerved, is not at all treating of that *Ceremony*; but only from the *Excellency* of that *Priviledge*, which the *Corinthians* had, as believing Chriſtians, *To partake of the fleſh and blood of Chriſt*, dehorts them from *Idolatry*, and *partaking* of the *Sacrifices* offered to *Idols*, ſo as thereby to offend or hurt their *weak Brethren*.

The Sacramental Union pretended, is a Figment.

Object. But that, which they moſt of all *Cry out* for in this matter, and are always *Noiſing*, is from 1 *Cor.* 11. where the Apoſtle is particularly treating of this matter; and therefore from ſome Words here they

they have the greateſt *Appearance* of *Truth* for their *Aſſertion*: As *ver.* 27. where he calls the *Cup*, *the Cup of the Lord*, and ſaith; *That they who eat of it, and drink it unworthily, are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*, and *ver.* 26. *Eat and drink their own Damnation*: intimating hence, that this hath an immediate or neceſſary relation to the *body*, *fleſh* and *blood of Chriſt*.

Though this at firſt View may catch the *Unwary Reader*; yet being well conſidered, it doth no ways Evince the matter in *Controverſie*. As for the *Corinthians* being in the *Uſe* of this *Ceremony*, why they were ſo, and how that *obliges* not *Chriſtians* now to the ſame, ſhall be ſpoken of hereafter: it ſuffices at this time to conſider, that they were in the *Uſe* of it. *Secondly*, That in the *Uſe* of it they were *guilty* of, and committed divers *Abuſes*. *Thirdly*: That the Apoſtle here is giving them Directions, how they may do it aright, in ſhewing them the *right* and *proper Uſe* and *End* of it. *Anſw.*

Theſe things being premiſed, let it be obſerved, that the very *expreſs* and *particular Uſe* of it, according to the Apoſtle is, *To ſhew forth the Lord's Death*, &c. But *to ſhew forth the Lord's Death*, and

partake of the flesh and blood of Christ, are different things: He saith not, *As often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye partake of the Body and Blood of Christ*; but, *Ye shew forth the Lord's Death*. So I acknowledge, that *this Ceremony*, by those that practise it, hath an *Immediate Relation* to the *outward Body* and *Death* of *Christ* upon the *Cross*, as being properly a *Memorial* of it; but it doth not thence follow, that it hath any *inward* or *immediate Relation* to *Believers communicating* or *partaking* of the *Spiritual Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, or that *Spirituvl Supper* spoken of *Rev.* 3. 20. For though in a general way, as every *Religious Action* in some respect hath a common relation to the *Spiritual Communion* of the *Saints* with *God*; so we shall not deny, but this hath a relation to others. Now for his calling the *Cup*, the *Cup* of the *Lord*, and saying, *They are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ, and eat their own Damnation, in not discerning the Lord's Body*, &c. I answer, that this infers no more *Necessary Relation*, than any other *Religious Act*; and amounts to no more than this, that since the *Corinthians* were in the *Use* of this *Ceremony*, and so performed it as a *Religious Act*, they ought

Christ's *Act* of *Bread* and *Wine* is not *obliging others.*

to

to do it *Worthily*, else they should bring *Condemnation* upon themselves. Now, this will not more infer the thing so practised by them, to be a *necessary, Religious Act*, obligatory upon others, than when *Rom.* 14. 6. the Apostle saith, *He that regardeth the Day, regardeth it unto the Lord*, it can be thence inferred, that the *Days* that some *esteemed* and *observed*, did lay an obligation upon *others* to do the same. But yet, as he that *Esteemed a Day*, and placed Conscience in keeping it, was to regard it to the *Lord*, and so it was to him, in so far as he dedicated it unto the Lord, the *Lord's Day*, he was to do it *Worthily*; and if he did it *Unworthily*, he would be *guilty* of the *Lord's Day*, and so keep it to his own *Damnation*: So also such as observe *this Ceremony* of *Bread* and *Wine*, it is to them the *Bread* of the *Lord*, and the *Cup* of the *Lord*, because they *Use* it as a *Religious Act*: And forasmuch as their *End* therein is, *To shew forth the Lord's Death*, and to *Remember his Body*, that was *Crucified* for them, and his *Blood*, that was *shed* for them; If notwithstanding they believe it is their *Duty* to do it, and make it a matter of *Conscience* to *forbear*, if they do it without that due *Preparation* and *Examination*,

nation, which every *Religious Act* ought to be performed in, then inſtead of *truly Remembring* the *Lord's Death*, and his *Body* and his *Blood*, they render themſelves *Guilty* of it, as being in *one Spirit* with thoſe, that *Crucified* him, and *ſhed* his *Blood*, though pretending with Thankſgiving and Joy to *Remember* it. Thus the *Scribes* and *Phariſees* of Old, though in *Memory* of the *Prophets* they garniſhed their Sepulchres, yet are ſaid by Chriſt to be *Guilty* of their *Blood*. And that no more can be hence inferred, appears from another ſaying of the ſame Apoſtle, *Rom.* 14. 23. *He that doubteth, is damned, if he eat*, &c. where he, ſpeaking of thoſe that judged it unlawful to *Eat fleſh*, &c. ſaith, *If they eat doubting, they eat their own Damnation.* Now it is manifeſt for all this, that either the *doing* or *forbearing* of this, was to another, that placed no *Conſcience* in it, of no moment; ſo I ſay, he that *Eateth* that, which in his *Conſcience* he is perſwaded is not lawful for him to *Eat*, doth *Eat* his own *Damnation*: So he alſo, that placeth *Conſcience* in *Eating bread* and *wine*, *as a Religious Act*, if he do it *Unprepared*, and without that due *reſpect*, wherein ſuch *Acts* ſhould be gone about, he *Eateth* and *Drinketh* his own *Damnation*,

The Phariſees guilty of the Blood of the Prophets.

not

not discerning the Lord's Body, i. e. not minding what he doth, to wit, with *a special Respect to the Lord, and by way of a special Commemoration of the Death of Christ.*

§ VI. I having now sufficiently shewn, what the *True Communion* of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* is, how it is *partaken* of, and how it has no *necessary Relation* to that Ceremony of *bread* and *Wine* used by Christ with his Disciples; it is fit now to consider the *Nature* and *Constitution* of that *Ceremony* (for as to the *proper Use* of it, we have had occasion to speak before) Whether it be a *standing Ordinance* in the *Church of Christ*, obligatory upon all; or indeed, whether it be any *necessary part* of the *Worship* of the *New Covenant-Dispensation*, or hath any *better* or *more binding Foundation*, than several other *Ceremonies* appointed and practised about the same time, which the most of our *Opposers* acknowledge to be *ceased*, and now no ways *binding* upon *Christians*? We find this *Ceremony* only mentioned in Scripture in *four* places, to wit, *Matthew*, *Mark* and *Luke*, and by *Paul* to the *Corinthians*: If any would infer any thing from the *frequency* of the *mentioning* of it, that will add nothing; for it being a *matter of Fact*, is there-

II. Whether this *Ceremony* be a *necessary Part* of the *New Covenant*, and *Obligatory*?

therefore mentioned by the *Evangeliſts*: And there are other things leſs *Memorable* as often, yea oftner mentioned. *Matthew* and *Mark* give only an Account of the *Matter of Fact*, without any *Precept* to do ſo afterwards; ſimply declaring, that *Jeſus* at that time did deſire them to *Eat* of the *Bread*, and *Drink* of the *Cup*: To which *Luke* adds theſe Words; *This do in Remembrance of me.* If we conſider this *Action of Chriſt* with his *Apoſtles*, there will appear nothing ſingular in it, for a *Foundation* to ſuch a *ſtrange Superſtructure*, as many in their *Airy Imaginations* have fought to build upon it; for both *Matthew* and *Mark* preſs it as an *Act* done by him, as he was *Eating*: *Matthew* ſaith, *And as they were Eating*; and *Mark*, *And as they did Eat, Jeſus took bread*, &c. Now this *Act* was no ſingular thing, neither any *ſolemn Inſtitution of a Goſpel Ordinance*, becauſe it was a *Conſtant Cuſtom* among the *Jews* (as *Paulus Riccius* obſerves at length in his *Celeſtial Agriculture*); That when they did *Eat* the *Paſſover*, the *Maſter* of the *Family* did *take* Bread, and *bleſs* it, and *breaking* gave of it to the reſt; and likewiſe *taking Wine*, did the ſame: So that there can nothing further appear in this, than that *Jeſus Chriſt*, who

Mat. 26. 26. Mark 14. 22. Luke 22. 19. 1 Cor. 11. 23.

The *breaking* of *Bread* was no ſingular thing, but a *Cuſtom* to *Jews*. *P. Riccius.*

who fulfilled all Righteouſneſs, and alſo obſerved the *Jewiſh Feaſts* and *Cuſtoms*, uſed this alſo among his *Diſciples* only, that, as in moſt other things he laboured to draw their Minds to a *further thing*; ſo in the uſe of this he takes occaſion to put them in mind of his *Death* and *Sufferings*, which were *ſhortly* to be: Which he did the oftner *Inculcate* unto them, for that they were *Averſe* from *believing* it. And as for that Expreſſion of *Luke*, *Do this in Remembrance of me*; it will amount to no more, than being the *laſt time*, that Chriſt did *Eat* with his *Diſciples*, he deſired them, that in their *Eating* and *Drinking* they might have regard to him; and by the *Remembring* of that opportunity, be the more ſtirred up to *follow him diligently* through *Sufferings and Death*, &c. But what man of Reaſon, laying aſide the Prejudice of *Education*, and the Influence of *Tradition*, will ſay, that this Account of the *Matter of Fact* given by *Matthew* and *Mark*, or this Expreſſion of *Luke*, to *do* that *in Remembrance of him*, will amount to theſe *Conſequences*, which the generality of *Chriſtians* have ſought to draw from it; as calling it *Auguſtiſſimum Euchariſtiæ Sacramentum*, *Venerabile Altaris Sacramentum*, *The Principal Seal of the Covenant of*

What it is, *To do this in Remembrance of Chriſt.*

Grace, by which all the Benefits of Chriſt's Death are ſealed to Believers, and ſuch like things? But to give a further Evidence, how theſe *Conſequences* have not any bottom from the *Practice* of that *Ceremony*, nor from the words following, *Do this*, &c. let us conſider another of the like Nature, as it is at length expreſſed by *John*, c. 13. *v.* 3, 4, 8, 13, 14, 15. *Jeſus riſeth from Supper, and laid aſide his Garments, and took a Towel, and girded himſelf: After that he poured Water into a Baſon, and began to Waſh the Diſciples Feet, and to wipe them with the Towel, wherewith he was girded. Peter ſaith unto him, Thou ſhalt never Waſh my Feet: Jeſus anſwered him, If I Waſh thee not, thou haſt no part with me. So after he had Waſhed their Feet, he ſaid, Know ye, what I have done to you? If I then your Lord and Maſter have Waſhed your Feet, ye alſo ought to Waſh one anothers Feet: For I have given you an* Example, *that ye ſhould do, as I have done to you.* As to which let it be obſerved, that *John* relates this Paſſage to have been done at the ſame time, with the other of *breaking* Bread, both being done the *Night* of the *Paſs-over*, after *Supper*. If we regard the *Narration* of this, and the *Circumſtances* attending it, it was done with far

Chriſt's *Waſhing* of *Feet*, and its *Manner* related.

far more *Solemnity*, and prescribed far more punctually and particularly, than the *former*. It is said only, *As he was Eating, he took* Bread; so that this would seem to be but an *Occasional business*: But here *he rose up, he laid by his Garments, he girded himself, he poured out the Water, he* Washed *their* Feet, *he wiped them with the Towel*; *He did this to all of them*: Which are *Circumstances* surely far more observable, than those noted in the other. The former was a Practice common among the *Jews*, used by all Masters of Families upon that occasion; but this, as to the Manner and Person acting it, to wit, for the Master to rise up, and Wash the Feet of his Servants and Disciples, was more singular and observable. In the breaking of Bread, and giving of Wine, it is not pleaded by our *Adversaries*, nor yet mentioned in the Text, that he particularly put them into the hands of all; but breaking it, and blessing it, gave it the neareſt, and so they from hand to hand: But here it is mentioned, that he Washed not the Feet of one or two, but of many. He saith not in the former, that if they do not eat of that Bread, and drink of that Wine, they shall be prejudiced by it; but here he saith expressly to *Peter*, that *if he Wash*

Compar'd with the *Breaking* of *Bread*.

not

not him, he hath no part with him: Which being ſpoken upon *Peter*'s Refuſing to let him Waſh his Feet, would ſeem to Import no leſs, than not the Continuance only, but even the Neceſſity of this Ceremony. In the former he ſaith, as it were paſſingly, *Do this in Remembrance of me*; but here he ſitteth down: Again, he deſires them to conſider what he hath done; tells them poſitively, *that as he hath done to them, ſo ought they to do to one another*: And yet again, he redoubles that Precept, by telling them, *he has given them an* Example, *that they ſhould do ſo likewiſe*. If we reſpect the Nature of the thing, it hath as much in it, as either Baptiſm or the breaking of Bread, ſeeing it is an outward Element of a cleanſing Nature, applied to the outward Man, by the Command and the Example of Chriſt, to ſignifie an inward purifying. I would willingly propoſe this ſeriouſly to Men that will be pleaſed to make uſe of that Reaſon and Underſtanding that God hath given them, and not be impoſed upon, nor abuſed by the Cuſtom or Tradition of others, Whether this Ceremony, if we reſpect either the Time, that it was Appointed in, or the Circumſtances, wherewith it was performed, or the Command enjoining

The Waſhing one anothers Feet was left, as an *Example.*

ing

ing the uſe of it, hath not as much to recommend it for a ſtanding Ordinance of the Goſpel, as either Water-Baptiſm, or Bread and Wine, or any other of that kind? I wonder then what Reaſon the *Papiſts* can give, why they have not numbred it among their *Sacraments*, except meerly *Voluntas Eccleſiæ & Traditio Patrum.*

But if they ſay, *That it is uſed among them, in that the* Pope *and ſome other Perſons among them, uſe to do it Once a* year *to ſome poor People.* Object.

I would willingly know what Reaſon they have, why This ſhould not be extended to *All*, as well as that of the *Euchariſt*, (as they term it;) or whence it appears from the Text, that [*Do this in remembrance of me*] ſhould be interpreted, that the Bread and Wine were every day to be taken by all *Prieſts*, or the Bread every day, or every week by the *People*; and that that other Command of *Chriſt*, *Ye ought to do as I have done to you*, &c. is only to be underſtood of the *Pope* or ſome other Perſons, to be done only to a *few*, and that *once a year*? Surely, there can be no other Reaſon for this difference aſſigned from the Text. And as to *Proteſtants*, who uſe not this Ceremony at all, if they will but open their eyes, they may ſee how that by *Cuſtom* *Anſw.*

The *Proteſtants* uſe not *Waſhing of feet.*

ſtom and *Tradition* they are abuſed in this matter, as were their *Fathers* in divers *Popiſh Traditions*. For if we look into the plain Scripture, what can be thence inferred to urge the One, which may not be likewiſe pleaded for the Other? Or for laying aſide the One, which may not be likewiſe ſaid againſt the Continuance of the Other? If they ſay, *That the former, of Waſhing the Feet, was only a Ceremony*; What have they, whence they can ſhew, that this *breaking of bread* is more? If they ſay, *That the former was only a Sign of Humility and Purifying*, What have they to prove that this was more? If they ſay, *The one was only for a Time, and was no Evangelical Ordinance:* What hath this to make it ſuch, that the other wanted? Surely there is no way of Reaſon to evite this, neither can any thing be alledged that the *one* ſhould *Ceaſe*, and not the *other*; or the *one Continue*, and not the other, but the meer *Opinion* of the Affirmers, which by *Cuſtom, Education* and *Tradition*, hath begotten in the hearts of People a greater Reverence for, and Eſteem of the *one*, than the *other:* Which, if it had fall'n out to be as much recommended to us by Tradition, would, no doubt, have been as tenaciouſly pleaded for, as having no leſs Foundation in the Scri-

Scripture. But ſince the *former*, to wit, the *Waſhing of one anothers Feet*, is juſtly laid aſide, as *not binding* upon *Chriſtians*, ſo ought alſo the *other*, for the ſame Reaſon.

§. VII. But I ſtrange that thoſe that are ſo Clamorous for this Ceremony, and ſtick ſo much to it, take liberty to diſpenſe with the *Manner* or *Method* that Chriſt did it in; ſince none, that ever I could hear of, who now do it, uſe it in the ſame way that he did it: Chriſt did it at Supper, while they were eating; but they do it in the Morning only by it ſelf: What Rule walk they by in this Change? The *breaking* of *Bread* not uſed now in the *ſame manner* as *Chriſt* did.

If it be ſaid, *Theſe are but Circumſtances, and not the Matter; and if the Matter be kept to, the alteration of Circumſtances is but of ſmall moment.* Object.

What if it ſhould be ſaid, the *Whole* is but a *Circumſtance* which fell out at that time when Chriſt did *Eat* the *Paſſover?* For if we have regard to that, which alone can be pleaded for an *Inſtitution*, viz. theſe Words, *Do this in remembrance of me*; it doth as properly relate to the *Manner*, as *Matter*. For how may or can they evince in Reaſon, that theſe Words, *Do this*, only ſignifie, *Eat Bread, and drink Wine*, but it is no matter *when ye eat*, nor *how* *Anſw.*

how ye eat it; and not, *as ye have seen me eat at Supper with you, who take Bread and break it, and give it you; and take the Cup, and bless it, and give it you, so do ye likewise?* And seeing Christ makes no distinction in those Words, *Do this*, it cannot be judged in Reason but to relate to the *whole*: Which if it do, all those that at present use this Ceremony among Christians, have not yet obeyed this Precept, nor fulfilled this Institution, notwithstanding all their Clamours concerning it,

Object. If it be said, *That the Time and Manner of doing it by Christ, was but Accidentally, as being after the Jewish Passover: which was at Supper.*

Answ. Besides that it may be answered and easily proved, *That the whole was Accidental*, as being the *Practice* of a *Jewish Ceremony*, as is above observed; May it not the same way be urged, that the *Drinking of Wine was Accidental*, as being the Natural Product of that Country? and so be pleaded, that in those Countries where Wine doth not grow, as in our Nation of *Scotland*, we may make use of *Beer* or *Ale*, in the use of this Ceremony, or *Bread* made of *other Grain* than that which Christ used? And yet would not our Adversaries judge this an *Abuse*, and not right peforming of this

The *breaking* of *Bread* was a *Jewish Ceremony.*

this *Sacrament?* Yea, have not *Scruples* of this kind occasioned no little Contention among the *Professors of Christianity?* What great Contest and Strife hath been betwixt the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches concerning the *Bread?* While the one will have it *Unleavened*, reckoning, because the Jews made use of *Unleavened Bread* in the *Passover*, that it was such kind of *Bread* that Christ did *break* to his Disciples; the other *Leavened*: Therefore the *Lutherans* make use of *Unleavened Bread*, the *Calvinists* of *Leavened*: And this Contest was so hot, when the *Reformation* was beginning at *Geneva*, that *Calvin* and *Farellus* were forced to *flee for it*. But do not *Protestants* by these *Uncertainties* open a Door to *Papists* for their excluding the *People from the Cup?* Will not [*Do this*] infer positively, that they should do *in the same Manner, and at the same Time*, which Christ did it, as well as that they should use the *Cup*, and not the *Bread only?* Or what reason have they to dispense with the One, more than the Papists have to do with the Other? O what strange Absurdities and Inconveniencies have Christians brought upon themselves, by superstitiously adhering to this Ceremony! Out of which Difficulties it is impossible for them to extricate themselves, but

Contests between the Greek and Latine Churches, concerning the Leaven'd and Unleaven'd Bread in the Supper.

Farellus.

but by laying it aſide, as they have done others of the like Nature. For beſides what is above-mentioned, I would gladly know, how from the words they can be certainly Reſolved, that theſe words [*Do this*] muſt be underſtood to the *Clergy*, *Take, bleſs and break this* Bread, *and give it to others*; but to the *Laity* only, *Take and eat*, but do not *bleſs?* &c.

The *Clergy Taking Bread*, do *bleſs* and *give* it; the *Laity* muſt *Take and Eat*, not *Bleſs* it.

Object. If it be ſaid, *That the Clergy was only preſent.*

Anſw. Then will not that open a Door for the *Popiſh Argument* againſt *the Adminiſtration of the Cup to the People?* Or may not another from thence as eaſily infer, *That only the Clergy ought to partake of this Ceremony*, becauſe they were *only* thoſe *preſent* to whom it was ſaid *Do this?* But if this [*Do this*] be extended to *all*, how comes it that *all have not liberty to obey it, in both bleſſing, breaking and diſtributing*, as well as *taking* and *eating?* Beſides all theſe, even the *Calvinian Proteſtants* of *Great Britain* could never yet accord among themſelves about the *Manner* of taking it, whether *ſitting*, *ſtanding*, or *kneeling*; whether it ſhould be given to the *Sick*, and *thoſe that are ready to Die*, or not: Which Controverſies, tho' they may be eſteemed of ſmall moment, yet have greatly contributed, with other things,

Hot Conteſts about the Manner of *Taking* it, and to whom to *Give* it.

things, to be the occasion not only of much Contention, but also of Blood-shed and Devastation; so that in this last respect the *Prelatick Calvinists* have termed the *Presbyterians* Schismatical and Pertinacious, and and they them again Superstitious, Idolatrous and Papistical. Who then that will open their Eyes, but may see that the Devil hath stirred up this Contention and Zeal, to busie men about things of small Moment, that greater Matters may be neglected, while he keeps them in such a do about this Ceremony; while they lay aside others of the like Nature, as positively Commanded, and as punctually Practised, and from the Observation of which, half so many Difficulties will not follow?

§ VIII. How then? Have we not Reason, not finding the Nature of this Practice to be obligatory upon us, more than those other our Adversaries have laid aside, to avoid all this Confusion, since those that use it, can never agree, neither concerning the Nature, Efficacy, nor Manner of doing it? And this proceeds, because they take it not plainly, as it lies in the Scripture; but have

ſo much mixed in their own Inventions.

For would they take it as it lies, it would import no more, than that *Jeſus Chriſt at that time did thereby ſignifie unto them, that his Body and Blood was to be offered for them*; and deſired them, that *whenſoever they did eat or drink, they might do it in Remembrance of him, or with a Regard to him, whoſe Blood was ſhed for them.*

Now that the *Primitive Church*, gathered immediately after his Aſcenſion, did ſo underſtand it, doth appear from their Uſe and Practice, if we admit thoſe places in the *Acts*, where *breaking of Bread* is ſpoken of, to have relation hereto; which as our Adverſaries do, ſo we ſhall willingly agree to. As firſt, *Acts* 2.42. *And they continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine, and Fellowſhip, and in Breaking of Bread*, &c. This cannot be underſtood of any other than of their *Ordinary Eating*; for as nothing elſe appears from the *Text*, ſo the *Context* makes it plain; for they *had all things in common*; and therefore it is ſaid, Ver.26. *And they continuing daily with one accord in the Temple, and* Breaking of Bread *from Houſe to Houſe, did eat their Meat*

By *Breaking* of *Bread* they had *all things* in *comman*; *Remembring* the *Lord.*

Meat with gladneſs, and ſingleneſs of heart. Who will not wilfully cloſe their Eyes, may ſee here, that their *Breaking* being joyned with their *Eating*, ſhews, that nothing elſe is here expreſſed, but that, having all things in common, and ſo continuing together, they alſo did *Break their Bread*, and *Eat* their *Meat together*: In doing whereof I ſhall not doubt but they *Remembred the Lord*, to follow whom they had with ſo great *Zeal* and *Reſignation* betaken themſelves. This is further manifeſt from *Acts* 6.26. For the Apoſtles having the *Care* and *Diſtribution* of that *Money*, which the Believers having ſold their Poſſeſſions gave unto them, finding themſelves over-charged with that Burthen, appointed Deacons for that buſineſs, that they might give themſelves continually to *Prayer*, and to the *Miniſtry* of the *Word*; not leaving that, to *ſerve Tables*. This cannot be meant of any Sacramental Eating, or Religious Act of Worſhip; ſeeing our Adverſaries make the *diſtributing* of that, the proper Act of *Miniſters*, not of *Deacons*: And yet there can be no Reaſon alledged, that that *Breaking of Bread* which they are ſaid to have *Continued in*, and to have done from *Houſe to*

Deacons appointed for ſerving at Tables.

Houſe, was other, than thoſe *Tables* that the Apoſtles *ſerved*, but here gave over, as finding themſelves over-charged with it.

Now as the increaſe of the Diſciples did incapacitate the Apoſtles any more to manage this; ſo it would ſeem their further Increaſe and Diſperſing in divers places, hindered the continuance of that Practice of having things in Common: But notwithſtanding, ſo far at leaſt to Remember or Continue that Antient Community, they did at certain times come together, and *break Bread* together. Hence it is ſaid, *Acts* 20. 7. that *Paul* coming to *Troas*, *And upon the firſt day of the Week, when the Diſciples came together to Break Bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the Morrow, and continued his Speech until Midnight*: Here is no mention made of any *Sacramental Eating*, but only, that *Paul* took occaſion from their being together, to preach unto them. And it ſeems, it was a Supper they intended, (not a Morning-Bit of Bread and Sup of Wine) elſe its not very probable, that *Paul* would from the Morning have preached until Midnight. But the Eleventh Verſe puts the matter

At *Troas* the *Supper* till *Midnight* deferred.

ter out of Dispute, which is thus: *When he therefore was come up again, and had* broken Bread, *and eaten, and talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed*: This shews, that the *Breaking* of *Bread* was deferred till that time; for those words [*and when he had* broken Bread, *and eaten*] do shew, that it had a relation to the *Breaking* of *Bread* aforementioned, and that that was the time he did it. *Secondly*; These words joined together, [*and when he had* broken Bread, *and eaten, and talked*] shew, it was no *Religious Act* of *Worship*, but only an *Eating* for *bodily Refreshment*, for which the Christians used to *Meet together* some time: And doing it in *God's Fear* and *Singleness of Heart*, doth notwithstanding difference it from the *Eating* or *Feasting* of *prophane Persons*. And this by some is called a *Love-Feast*, or a being together not meerly to *feed* their *Bellies*, or for outward Ends; but to take thence occasion to *Eat* and *Drink* together in the Dread and *Presence* of the *Lord*, as his People: Which *Custom* we shall not *Condemn*; but let it be observed, that in all the *Acts* there is no other, nor further mention of this matter. But if that *Ceremony* had been some

They only did *Eat* for *refreshing* the *Body*.

By some called a *Love-Feast*.

Solemn Sacrifice, as *ſome* will have it, or ſuch a *Special Sacrament*, as others plead it to be, it is ſtrange, that that *Hiſtory*, that in many leſſer things gives a *particular Account* of the *Chriſtians Behaviour*, ſhould have been ſo ſilent in the matter: Only we find, that they uſed ſometimes to *Meet together* to *break* Bread and *Eat*. Now as the *Primitive Chriſtians* began by degrees to depart from that *Primitive Purity* and *Simplicity*, ſo as to accumulate *Superſtitious Traditions*, and vitiate the *Innocent Practices* of their *Predeceſſors*, by the intermixing either of *Jewiſh* or *Heatheniſh* Rites; ſo alſo in the *Uſe* of this, very early *Abuſes* began to creep in among Chriſtians, ſo that it was needful for the Apoſtle *Paul* to *Reform* them, and *Reprove* them therefore, as he doth at large, 1 *Cor.* 11. from *ver.* 17. to the End: Which place we ſhall particularly Examine, becauſe our *Adverſaries* lay the *chief Streſs* of their matter upon it; and we ſhall ſee, whether it will infer any more, than we have above granted. *Firſt*, Becauſe they were apt to uſe that *Practice* in a *ſuperſtitious* mind beyond the *true Uſe* of it, as to make of it ſome *Myſtical Supper* of the *Lord*, he tells them, *v.* 20. That their

Coming

The *Chriſtians* began by degrees to *depart from the Primitive Purity.*

1 Cor. 11. 17. Concerning the *Supper* (of the *Lord*, ſo called) Explained.

Coming together into one place, is not to Eat the Lord's Supper; he ſaith not, *This is not the right Manner to Eat*, but, *This is is not to Eat the Lord's Supper*; becauſe the *Supper* of the *Lord* is *Spiritual, and a Myſtery. Secondly*, He blames them, in that they *come together for the worſe*, and *not for the better*; the Reaſon he gives of this, is *ver.* 21. *For in Eating every one hath taken before his own* Supper; *and one is hungry, and another is drunken*: Here it is plain, that the Apoſtle Condemns them for that, becauſe this Cuſtom of Supping in general was uſed among Chriſtians for to increaſe their Love, and as a Memorial of *Chriſt's Supping* with the *Diſciples*, that they ſhould have ſo vitiated it, to *eat it apart*; and to come *full*, who had abundance, and *hungry*, who had little at home; whereby the very *Uſe* and *End* of this Practice is loſt and perverted: And therefore he blames them, that they do not either Eat this in Common at home, or reſerve their Eating, till they come all together to the *Publick Aſſembly*. This appears plainly by the following *verſe* 22. *Have ye not Houſes to eat and to drink in? Or deſpiſe ye the Church of God, and ſhame them, that have not?* Where he blames

Why the *Cuſtom* of *Supping* in *Common* was uſed among *Chriſtians?*

them for their *Irregular Practice* herein, in that they despised to *Eat orderly*, or reserve their *Eating* to the *Publick Assembly*, and so shaming such as not having *Houses*, nor *Fulness* at home, came to partake of the *Common Table*; who, being *hungry*, thereby were ashamed, when they observed others come thither *full* and *drunken*. Those that without prejudice will look to the place, will see, this must have been the *Case* among the *Corinthians*: For supposing the *Use* of this to have been then, as now *used* either by *Papists*, *Lutherans* or *Calvinists*, it is hard making sense of the Apostle's words, or indeed to conceive, what was the Abuse the *Corinthians* committed in this thing. Having thus observed, what the Apostle said above; because this Custom of *Eating and Drinking together some time*, had its rise from *Christ's Act with the Apostles the Night he was betrayed*; therefore the Apostle proceeds, *ver.* 23. to give them an Account of that: *For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same Night, in which he was betrayed, took* Bread, *&c.* Those, that understand the difference betwixt a Narration of a thing, and a Com-

The Rise of that Custom.

mand

mand, cannot but see, if they will, that there is no Command in this place, but only an *Account* of *Matter of Fact*: He saith not, *I received of the Lord, that as he took Bread, so I should command it to you to do so also*; there is nothing like this in the place: Yea, on the contrary, *ver.* 25. where he repeats *Christ's Imperative Words* to his Apostles, he placeth them so, as they import no Command; *This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in Remembrance of me*: And then he adds; *For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death, till he come*: But these words [as often] imports no more a Command, than to say, *As often as thou goest to* Rome, *see the Capitol*; will infer a Command to me, to go thither.

That (*as often*) imports no *Command* of this *Supper.*

But whereas they urge the last words, *Ye shew forth the Lords Death, till he come*, insinuating, That *this imports a necessary Continuance of that Ceremony, until Christ come at the end of the World to Judgment.* Object.

I. *Answer*: They take *Two* of the *Chief Parts* of the *Controversie* here for granted, without proof. *First*, That [*as often*] imports a Command, the contrary whereof *Answ.*

is

Christ's *Outward* and *Inward Coming.*

is ſhewn; neither will they ever be able to prove it. *Secondly*, That this *Coming* is underſtood of *Chriſt's laſt outward Coming*, and not of his *Inward* and *Spiritual*, that remains to be proved; whereas the Apoſtle might well underſtand it of his *Inward Coming* and *Appearance*, which perhaps ſome of thoſe *Carnal Corinthians*, that uſed to come *drunken* together, had not yet known: And others, being *Weak* among them, and inclinable to *dote* upon *Outwards*, this might have been *Indulged* to them for a ſeaſon, and even uſed by thoſe, who knew *Chriſt's Appearance* in *Spirit*, (as other things were, of which we ſhall ſpeak hereafter) eſpecially by the Apoſtle, who became *Weak* to the *Weak*, and *All* to *All*, that he might *ſave* ſome. Now thoſe *Weak* and *Carnal Corinthians* might be permitted the *Uſe* of this, to *Shew forth* or *Remember Chriſt's Death*, till he *come* to *Ariſe* in them; for though ſuch need thoſe outward things to put them in mind of *Chriſt's Death*, yet ſuch, as are *dead* with *Chriſt*, and not only *dead* with *Chriſt*, but *buried*, and alſo *ariſen* with him, need not ſuch *Signs* to *Remember* him. And to ſuch therefore the Apoſtle ſaith, *Col.* 3. 1. *If ye*

To *Remember* Chriſt's *Death* till he *come.* To *Ariſe* in the *Heart.*

then

then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God: But *Bread* and *Wine* are not these things, that are *above*; but are things of the Earth. But that this whole matter was a meer *Act* of *Indulgence* and *Condescendence* of the Apostle *Paul* to the *Weak* and *Carnal Corinthians*, appears yet more by the *Syriack* Copy, which *ver.* 17. in his entring upon this matter, hath it thus: *In that, concerning which I am about to command you* (or *instruct you*,) *I commend you not, because ye have not gone forward, but are descended unto that, which is less*, (or *of less Consequence*:) Clearly importing, that the Apostle was *grieved*, that such was their Condition, that he was forc'd to give them *Instructions* concerning those *Outward things*; and *doting* upon which they shew, they were not gone forward in the *Life* of *Christianity*; but rather sticking in *beggarly Elements*. And therefore *ver.* 20. the same *Version* hath it thus; *When then ye meet together, ye do not do it, as it is just ye should do in the day of the Lord, ye eat and drink*: Thereby shewing to them, that *To Meet together to eat and drink Outward Bread*

And likewise the other *Oriental Versions*, as the *Arabick*, and Æthiopick, have it the same way.

and

and Wine, was not the *Labour and Work of that Day of the Lord.* But ſince our *Adverſaries* are ſo zealous for this *Ceremony*, becauſe uſed by the *Church* of *Corinth*, (though with how little ground, is already ſhewn) how come they to paſs over far more *poſitive Commands* of the Apoſtles, as matters of no moment? As *Firſt*, *Acts* 15. 26. where the Apoſtles peremptorily *Command* even the *Gentiles*, as that, which was the *Mind* of the Holy Ghoſt, *To abſtain from things ſtrangled, and from Blood?* And *Jam.* 5. 14. where it is expreſly Commanded, *That the Sick be Anointed with Oil in the Name of the Lord.*

To abſtain from things ſtrangled.

The *Anointing* with *Oil.*

Object. If they ſay, *Theſe were only Temporary things, but not to Continue.*

Anſw. What have they more to ſhew for this, there being no expreſs *Repeal* of them?

Object. If they ſay; *The Repeal is implied, becauſe the Apoſtle ſaith, We ought not to be judged in Meats and Drinks.*

Anſw. I admit the Anſwer; but how can it be

be evited to militate the same way against the *other Practice?* Surely not at all: nor can there be any thing urged for the *one*, more than for the *other*, but *Custom* and *Tradition.*

And for that of *James*, they say, *There followed a Miracle upon it*, to wit, *the Recovery of the Sick*; But, *this being Ceased, so should the Ceremony.* Object.

Though this might many ways be answered, to wit; That *Prayer* then might as well be *forborn*, to which also the *saving* of the *Sick* is there ascribed: Yet I shall accept of it, because I judge indeed, that *Ceremony* is *Ceased*; only me thinks, since our *Adversaries* (and that rightly) think, a *Ceremony* ought to *Cease*, where the *Vertue fails*; they ought by the same Rule, to forbear the *laying* on of *Hands*, in *Imitation of the Apostles*, since the *Gift* of the *Holy Ghost* doth not follow upon it. *Answ.* A *Ceremony* ought to *Cease*, its *Vertue failing.* Thus *Laying on of hands.*

§ IX. But since we find, that several *Testimonies* of *Scripture* do sufficiently shew, that *Such External Rites are no necessary part of the* New Covenant-Dispensation

ſation, *therefore not needful now to Continue*, however they were for a ſeaſon practiſed of old; I ſhall inſtance ſome few of them, whereby from the Nature of the thing, as well as thoſe *Teſtimonies*, it may appear, that the *Ceremony* of *Bread* and *Wine* is *Ceaſed*, as well as thoſe other things, confeſſed by our *Adverſaries* to be ſo. The *firſt* is *Rom.* 14. 17. *For the Kingdom of God is not Meat and Drink, but Righteouſneſs and Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghoſt*: Here the Apoſtle evidently ſhews, that the *Kingdom* of *God*, or *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*, ſtands not in *Meats* and *Drinks*, and ſuch like things, but in *Righteouſneſs*; as by the *Context* doth appear, where he is ſpeaking of the *Guilt* and *Hazzard* of *judging one another about Meats and Drinks*. So then, if the *Kingdom* of *God* ſtand not in them, nor the *Goſpel*, nor *Work* of *Chriſt*, then the Eating of *Outward Bread* and *Wine* can be no neceſſary part of the *Goſpel-Worſhip*, nor any *perpetual Ordinance* of it. Another is yet more plain of the ſame Apoſtle, *Col.* 2. 16. The Apoſtle throughout this whole *Second Chapter* doth clearly plead *for us*, and againſt the *Formality* and *Superſtition* of our *Oppoſers*: For in the beginning he holds

The Ceremony of *Bread* and *Wine* is Ceas'd.

Col. 2.

holds forth the great *Priviledges* Christians have by Christ, who are come indeed to the *Life* of *Christianity*; and therefore he desires them, *ver. 6. As they have received Christ, so to walk in him, and to beware, lest they be spoiled through Philosophy and vain Deceit, after the Rudiments or Elements of the World, because that in Christ, whom they have received, is all Fulness: And that they are Circumcised with the Circumcision made without Hands* (which he calls the *Circumcision* of *Christ*) *and being buried with him by* Baptism, *are also arisen with him through the Faith of the Operation of God.* Here also they did partake of the *True Baptism* of *Christ*; and being such, as are *Arisen* with him, let us see, whether he thinks it needful, they should make use of such *Meat* and *Drink*, as *Bread* and *Wine, to put them in Remembrance of Christ's Death?* Or whether they ought to be *judged*, that they did it not, *ver. 16. Let no Man therefore judge you in Meat or Drink?* Is not *Bread* and *Wine, Meat and Drink?* But why? *Which are a Shadow of things to come: But the Body is of Christ.* Then since our *Adversaries* Confess, that their *Bread* and *Wine* is a *Sign* or *Shadow*, therefore, according to the Apostle's

'Tis but a *Sign* and *Shadow*, they confess.

poſtle's Doctrine, we ought not to be *Judged* in the *Obſervation* of it. But is it not fit for thoſe, that are *Dead* with *Chriſt*, to be ſubject to ſuch *Ordinances?* See what he ſaith, *ver.* 20. *Wherefore, if ye be dead with Chriſt from the Rudiments of the World, why, as though living in the World, are ye ſubject to Ordinances? (Touch not, taſte not, handle not: Which all are to periſh with the Uſing) after the Commandments and Doctrines of Men:* What can be more plain? If this ſerve not to take away the *Abſolute Neceſſity* of the uſe of *Bread* and *Wine*, what can it ſerve to take away? Sure I am, the Reaſon here given is applicable to them, *which all do periſh with the uſing*; ſince *Bread* and *Wine periſheth* with the *uſing*, as much as other things. But further, if the uſe of *Water*, and *Bread* and *Wine* were that, wherein the very *Seals* of the *New Covenant* ſtood, and did pertain to the *Chief Sacraments* of the *Goſpel* and *Evangelical Ordinances*, (ſo called) then would not the *Goſpel* differ from the *Law*, or be preferrable to it? Whereas the Apoſtle ſhews the difference, *Heb.* 9. 10. in that ſuch kind of Obſervations of the *Jews* were as a *Sign* of the *Goſpel*, for that this *ſtood only in Meats and*

And which do *periſh* with the *Uſing*.

The *Law* was *Meats* and *Drinks* not ſo the *Goſpel*.

and Drinks, and divers Washings. And now, if the *Gospel-Worship* and *Service* stand in the same, where is the difference?

If it be said, *These under the Gospel have a Spiritual Signification.* Object.

So had those under the *Law*, *God* was the *Author* of those, as well as Christ is pretended to be the *Author* of these. But doth not this contending for the use of *Water*, *Bread* and *Wine*, as necessary Parts of the *Gospel-Worship*, destroy the Nature of it, as if the *Gospel* were a *Dispensation* of *Shadows*, and not of the *Substance*; whereas the Apostle in that of the *Colossians* above-mentioned argues against the *Use* of these things, as needful to those, that are *dead* and *arisen* with *Christ*, because they are but *Shadows?* And since through the whole *Epistle* to the *Hebrews*, he argues with the *Jews* to *Wean* them from their *Worship*, for this Reason, because it was *Typical* and *Figurative*; is it agreeable to *right Reason* to bring them to another of the *same Nature?* What ground from *Scripture* or *Reason* can our *Adversaries* bring us to evince, *Answ.* The Law has Shadows the Gospel brings Substance.

evince, that one *Shadow* or *Figure* ſhould point to another *Shadow* or *Figure*, and not to the *Subſtance*? And yet they make the *Figure* of *Circumciſion* to point to *Water-Baptiſm*, and the *Paſchal Lamb* to *Bread* and *Wine*. But was it ever known, that one *Figure* was the *Antitype* of the other, eſpecially, ſeeing *Proteſtants* make not theſe their *Antitypes* to have any more Vertue or Efficacy, than the *Type* had? For ſince, as they ſay, and that truly, *That their Sacraments confer not Grace, but that is conferred according to the Faith of the Receiver*; it will not be denied, but the *Faithful* among the *Jews* received alſo *Grace* in the Uſe of their *Figurative Worſhip*. And though *Papiſts* boaſt, that their *Sacraments* confer *Grace ex opere operato*, yet Experience abundantly proveth the contrary.

Their *Sacraments* confer not *Grace*.

§ X. But ſuppoſing the Uſe of Water-Baptiſm, and Bread and Wine, to have been in the *Primitive Church*, as was alſo that of *Abſtaining from things ſtrangled, and from Blood*; the uſe of *Legal Purifications*, Acts 21. 23, 24, 25. and *Anointing of the Sick with Oyl*, for the Reaſons and Grounds

Oppoſers claim *a Power* to give their *Sacraments* from whence do they *derive* it?

Grounds before-mentioned: Yet it remains for our Adversaries to shew us how they come by Power or Authority to Administer them? It cannot be from the Letter of the Scripture, else they behoved also to do those other things, which the Letter declares also they did, and which in the Letter have as much Foundation. Then their power must be derived from the Apostles either Mediately, or Immediately; but we have shewn before, in the Tenth *Proposition*, that they have no Mediate Power, because of the Interruption made by the *Apostacy*: And for an Immediate Power or Command by the Spirit of God, to Administer these things, none of our Adversaries pretend to it.

We know, that in this, as in other things, they make a Noise of the *Constant Consent* of the *Church*, and of *Christians* in all *Ages*: But as *Tradition* is not a sufficient Ground for *Faith*, so in this matter especially it ought to have but *small Weight*, for that in this Point of Ceremonies and Superstitious Observations, the Apostacy began very early; as may appear in the Epistles of *Paul* to the

Tradition no sufficient *ground* for *Faith*.

Galatians and *Coloſſians*: And we have no ground to imitate them in thoſe things, whoſe Entrance the Apoſtle ſo much withſtood, ſo heavily regretted, and ſo ſharply reproved.

But if we look to *Antiquity*, we find that in ſuch kind of Obſervances and Traditions, they were very uncertain and changeable; ſo that neither *Proteſtants* nor *Papiſts* do obſerve this Ceremony, as They did, both in that they gave it to Young Boys and to Little Children: And for ought can be learned, the Uſe of this and Infant-Baptiſm are of a like Age; though the one be laid aſide both by Papiſts and Proteſtants, and the other, to wit, Baptiſm of Infants, be ſtuck to.

The Supper they gave to Young Boys and Children.

And we have ſo much the leſs Reaſon to lay Weight upon *Antiquity*, for that, if we conſider their Profeſſion of Religion, eſpecially as to Worſhip, and the Ceremonial Part of it, we ſhall not find any Church now, whether *Papiſh* or *Proteſtant*, who differ not widely from them in many things; as *Daleus* in his Treatiſe concerning the uſe of the Fathers,

Daleus.

thers, well Obſerveth and Demonſtrateth.

And why they ſhould Obtrude this upon us, becauſe of the *Ancient's Practice*, which they themſelves *follow not*; or why we may not *Reject This*, as well as they do *Other Things*, no leſs Zealouſly practiſed by the *Ancients*, there is no ſufficient Reaſon can be aſſigned.

I ſhall not nevertheleſs doubt, but that many, whoſe Underſtandings have been *Clouded* with theſe *Ceremonies*, have notwithſtanding by the Mercy of God, had ſome Secret Senſe of the Myſtery, which they could not Clearly Underſtand, becauſe it was Vailed from them, by their ſticking unto ſuch Outward Things: And that through that Secret Senſe Diving in their Comprehenſions, they ran themſelves into theſe Carnal Apprehenſions, as imagining, the Subſtance of the Bread was Changed; or if the Subſtance was not changed, yet the *Body* was there, *&c.*

And indeed, I am inclinable very favourably

Calvin's ingenuous Confession commended

vourably to judge of *Calvin* in this particular, in that he deals so ingenuously to confess, he *neither Comprehends, nor can express it in Words; but yet by a feeling Experience can say, The Lord is spiritually present.*

Now as I do not doubt, but *Calvin* sometimes had a *Sense* of this *Presence* without the Use of this Ceremony, so as the Understanding given him of God, made him justly reject the false Notions of *Transubstantiation* and *Consubstantiation*, though he knew not *what to Establish* instead of them: If he had fully waited in that *Light* that makes *all Things* Eph. 5.15. *Manifest*, and had not laboured in his own Comprehension, to settle upon that External Ceremony, by affixing the Spiritual Presence as Chiefly or Principally, though not only (as he well knew by Experience) there, or especially to relate to it; he might have reached further unto the *Knowledge* of this Mystery, than many that went before him.

In tenderness of Conscience at Ignorance God winketh.

§ XI. Lastly, If any now at this Day, from a true *Tenderness* of *Spirit*, and with real *Conscience* towards *God*, did practise this Ceremony in the same Way, Me-

Method and Manner, as did the Primitive Chriſtians recorded in Scripture, (which yet none, that I know, now do) I ſhould not doubt to affirm, but they might be indulged in it; and the Lord might regard them, and for a ſeaſon *Appear* to them in the Uſe of theſe things; as many of us have known him to do to us, in the time of our Ignorance: Provided always, they did not ſeek to *Obtrude* them upon others, nor Judge ſuch as found themſelves Delivered, or that they do not pertinaciouſly adhere to them.

For we certainly know that the Day is *Dawned*, in which God hath Ariſen, and hath Diſmiſſed all thoſe *Ceremonies* and *Rites*, and is only to be *Worſhipped* in *Spirit*; and that he *Appears* to them who *Wait* upon him: And that to *Seek God in theſe things* is, with *Mary* at the *Sepulcher*, To *ſeek the Living among the Dead:* For we know that he is *Ariſen*, and *Revealed* in *Spirit*, leading his *Children* out of theſe *Rudiments*; that they may *Walk* with Him in his *Light*: To whom be Glory for ever! *Amen.*

The *Day* is *Dawn'd* that *God* is *Riſen*, and *Worſhipped* in *Spirit.*

THE END.

BOOKS Printed and Sold by T. Sowle, *next to the* Meeting-House *in* White-Hart-Court *in* Gracious-Street.

THE Works of that Memorable and Ancient Servant of Christ, *Stephen Crisp*; containing also a Journal of his Life, giving an Account of his Convincement, Travels, Labours, and Sufferings in and for the Truth. Price bound 5s.

A Collection of the several Writings and Faithful Testimonies of that Suffering Servant of God, and patient Follower of the Lamb, *Humphry Smith*. Price bound 2 s. 6 d.

A Collection of certain Epistles and Testimonies of Divine Consolation, Experience and Doctrine; Written by that Faithful, Patient, and Long-suffering Servant of Christ, *William Bennit*. Price bound 1 s. 8 d.

The Memory of the Righteous Revived, being a brief Collection of the Books and written Epistles of *John Camm* and *John Audland*: Together with several Testimonies relating to those two Faithful Labourers. Price bound 2 s.

Truth Vindicated, by the Faithful Testimony and Writings of the Innocent Servant and Handmaid of the Lord *Elizabeth Bathurst*, Deceased. Price bound 1 s.

A Catechism and Confession of Faith. By *R. Barclay*, Price bound 9 *d*.

No Cross, No Crown. A Discourse shewing the *Nature* and *Discipline* of the Holy Cross of Christ. By *W. Penn*, In two Parts; Price 3 *s*.

An Account of *W. Penn*'s Travails in *Holland* and *Germany*, Anno MDCLXXVII. Price 2 *s*.

A Brief Account of the *Rise* and *Progress* of the People called *Quakers*. By *W. Penn*. Price 1*s*.

BOOKS Printed and Sold by *T. Sowle*, in *White-Hart-Court* in *Gracious-Street*, and at the *Bible* in *Leaden-Hall-Street*, 1699.

TRuth's Principles: Or, those things about Doctrine and Worship which are most surely believed and received amongst the People of God, called *Quakers*, viz. Concerning the Man Christ; His Sufferings, Death, Resurrection, Faith in his Blood, the Imputation of his Righteousness, Sanctification, Justification, *&c.* by *John Crook*: To wich is added, somewhat concerning the Difference between the Persuasions of Reason, and the Persuasions of Faith. By *Isaac Penington.* price stitch'd 3 *d.*

A Defence of a Paper, Entituled, *Gospel-Truth*, against the Exceptions of the Bishop of *Cork*'s Testimony. (Against the *Quakers.*) By *W. Penn.* price Bound 12 *d.*

Anguis Flagellatus: Or, a Switch for the *Snake*: Being an Answer to the Third and Last Edition of *The Snake in the Grass.* Wherein that Author's Injustice and Falshood, both in Quotation and Story, are discovered and obviated. And the Truth Doctrinally delivered by Us, stated and maintained in Opposition to his Misrepresentation and Perversion. By *Joseph Wyeth.* To which is added a Supplement by *George Whitehead.*

The Christian Quaker and his Divine Testimony stated and vindicated, from Scripture, Reason and Authority. By *W. Penn.* price Bound 2 *s.*

England's present Interest considered, with Honour to the Prince, and Safety to the People. In Answer to this one Question, *What is most Fit Easie and Safe to be done, for Allaying the Heat of*

contrary Intereſts, and making them Conſiſtent with the Proſperity of the Kingdom? Submitted to the Conſideration of our Superiours. By *W. Penn.* price Bound 1 *s.*

The Tryal of Spirits both in Teachers and Hearers. Wherein is held forth the clear Diſcovery and certain Downfal of the Carnal and Antichriſtian Clergy of theſe Nations. Teſtified from the Word of God to the Univerſity Congregations in *Cambrige.* Whereunto is added, a plain and neceſſary Confutation of divers Groſs Errors delivered by Mr. *Sydrach Sympſon,* in a Sermon preached to the ſame Congregation at the Commencement, *Anno* MDCLIII. Wherein (among other things) is declared, that the Univerſities (according to their preſent Statutes and Practices) are not (as he affirmed) anſwerable to the Schools of the Prophets in the time of the Law; but rather to the Idolatrous High Places. And that Humane Learning is not a Preparation appointed by Chriſt, either for the right Underſtanding, or right Teaching the Goſpel. With a brief Teſtimony againſt Divinity-Degrees in the Univerſities. As alſo *Luther*'s Teſtimony at large upon the whole Matter. And laſtly, The right Reformation of Learning, Schools, and Univerſities, according to the State of the Goſpel, and the Light that ſhines therein. All neceſſary for the Inſtruction and Direction of the Faithful in theſe laſt times. By *William Dell,* Miniſter of the Goſpel, and Maſter of *Convil* and *Caius* College in *Cambrige.* price Bound 1 *s.* 6 *d.*

The Defence of the People called *Quakers:* Being a Reply, to a Book lately Publiſhed by certain Prieſts of the County of *Norfolk,* under the pretended Title of *The Quakers Challenge.* And con-

containing ſome brief and modeſt Animadverſions upon the Book it ſelf. Several Certificates, which Detect the Errors in thoſe of *Weſt-Dereham*, and Clear the People called *Quakers* of the ſaid Challenge. The Letters that paſſed between Them and the Prieſts. price Stitch'd 6 *d.*

Truth and Innocency Vindicated, and the People called *Quakers* Defended, in Principle and Practice, againſt Invidious Attempts and Calumnies. Being a juſt Examination of two Books againſt the ſaid People, Entituled, 1ſt, *A Brief Diſcovery*, &c. by three *Norfolk* Prieſts. 2d, *Some few of the* Quakers *many horrid Blaſphemies*, &c. being a *Scandalous Libel*; Examined by *George Whitehead* a Servant of Chriſt: Containing alſo many of the repeated Abuſes in *John Meriton*'s *Antidote*, and *Francis Bugg*'s *Pilgrim's Progreſs*. price 9 *d.*

The Friendly Enquirer's Doubts and Objections anſwered: Concerning The Light within, the Word of God, the Church of Chriſt, Goſpel Miniſters, Ordinances in General and in Particular, Water-Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper: Together with a brief Teſtimony againſt Oths and Tithes. Firſt intended and written for te Satisfaction of ſome particular Acquaintanc; and now publiſhed for more General Serce. By *James Jackſon.* price Bound 6 *d.*

Eſſays about the Poor, Manufactur, Trade Plantations and Immorality, and of th Excellency and Divinity of Inward Light; deonſtrated from the Attributes of God, and the Nature of Man's Soul, as well as from the Ttimony of Holy Scriptnres. By *John Bellers.* pe Stitch'd 4 *d.*

Enchiridion. Containing Maxims Divine and Moral. price Bound 9 *d.*

The

The Works of that Memorable and Ancient Servant of Christ, *Stephen Crisp*; containing also a Journal of his Life, giving an Account of his Convincement, Travels, Labours and Sufferings in, and for the Truth. Price Bound 5 s.

The Memory of the Righteous Revived, being a brief Collection of the Books and written Epistles of *John Camm* and *John Audland*: Together with several Testimonies relating to those two Faithful Labourers. Price Bound 2 s.

Baptism and the Lord's Supper, Substantially Asserted; being an Apology in behalf of the People called *Quakers*, concerning those Two Heads. By *Robert Barclay*. Price Bound 1 s.

A Catechism and Confession of Faith, By *R. Barclay*. Price Bound 9 d.

No Cross, No Crown. A Discourse shewing the Nature and Discipline of the Holy Cross of Christ. By *W. Penn*. In Two Parts. The Fifth Edition. Price Bound 3 s.

An Account of *W. Penn*'s Travails in *Holland* and *Germany*, for the Service of the Gospel of Christ; by way of Journal. Containing also divers Letters and Epistles writ to several Great and Eminent Persons whilst there. The Second Impression, Corrected by the Author's own Copy, with some Answers not before Printed. Price Bound 3 s.

A Brief Account of the Rise and Progress of the People called *Quakers*, in which their Fundamental Priciple, Doctrines, Worship, Ministry and Discipline are plainly Declared, to prevent the Mistake and Perversions that Ignorance and Prejudice may make to abuse the Credulous. With a Summary Relation of the former Dispensations of God in the World, by way of

In-

Introduction. By *W. Penn.* Price Bound 1 s.

The Harmony of Divine and Heavenly *Doctrines*, Demonſtrated in ſundry Declarations on Variety of Subjects. Preached at the *Quakers* Meetings in *London*, by Mr. *W. Penn*, Mr. *G. Whitehead*, Mr. *S. Waldenfield*, Mr. *B. Coole*, Taken in Short-hand as it was delivered by them; and now Faithfully Tranſcribed and Publiſhed for the Information of thoſe who by reaſon of Ignorance may have received a Prejudice againſt them. By a Lover of that People. Price Bound 1 s. 6 d.

Primitive Chriſtianity Revived, in the Faith and Practice of the People called *Quakers*. Written in Teſtimony to the preſent Diſpenſation of God, through them to the World: That Prejudices may be Removed, the Simple Informed, the Well-enclined Encouraged, and the Truth and its Innocent Friends Rightly Repreſented. By *W. Penn.* Price Bound 1 s.

A Diurnal Speculum; containing, I. A plain and eaſie Method to find out thoſe things that are moſt uſeful to be known Yearly: And may ſerve as an Almanack for Thirty Years; and may other things ſuitable to the Matter, *&c.* II. A Explanation of Weights, Mony, and Meaſure, both Scriptural and Uſual, with ſundry Table depending thereon, *&c.* III. Some Remarks on *England*; or a Brief Account of every County, with the Names, and Days of the Markets, and the Chief Commodities therein, *&c.* The whol conſiſting of great Variety, explained by diver Examples, the like in all particulars not extant; as by the Contents does more at large appear Collected by *J. B.* Price Bound 1 s. 6 d.

The Arraignment of Popery; bei a Collection taken out of the Chronicles and her Books of the

the State of the Church in the Primitive Times. I. The State of the Papiſt; how long it was before the Univerſal POPE and MASS was ſet up; and the bringing in their Rudiments, Traditions, Beads, Images, Purgatories, Tythes and Inquiſitions. II. A Relation of the Cruelties they acted after the Pope got up, being worſe than the *Turk* and *Heathen*: *New Rome* proving like *Old*. III. What the People of *England* Worſhipped before they were Chriſtians. VI. To which is added, the Blood of the Martyrs is the Seed of the Church. With ſeveral other things, very profitable for all that fear God to Read, Try and give Judgment by the Spirit of Truth, againſt the Worſhip of the Beaſt and Whore. Price Bound 1 s. 6 d.

An Invitation from the Spirit of Chriſt, to all that are a Thirſt, to come and Drink of the Waters of Life freely, which proceed from the Fountain of Eternal Life: Shewing how all may come, that are willing, to Drink thereof to their full Satisfaction; whereby they may attain unto perfect Health and Salvation of their Souls for ever in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt. And alſo, ſhewing what it is that hindereth People from being truly a Thirſt after the Waters of Life; and from coming to Drink thereof; with the deſtructive Quality of that which hindered; and how it may be avoided. Conclude with a word to all Singers, upon a Religious or Spiritual Account. Written by *Henry Mollineux*. Price Bound 1 s.

Spira Reſtans; or the Way to the Kingdom of Heaven, by the Gates of Hell; in an Extraordinary Exampl By a Perſon brought to the depths of Deſpair a Anguiſh, recovered by the Mighty Grace an Power of God, and raiſed to the heights of Aſſurance and Joy. Wherein are ſome

un-

uncommon Conſiderations concerning the manner of Salvation and Damnation, Life and Death, Happineſs and Miſery. With ſome Fundamental Arguments for the Immortality of the Soul. Price Stitch'd 4 d.

A few Queries relating to the Practice of Phyſick, with Remarks upon ſome of them. Modeſtly propoſed to the ſerious Conſideration of Mankind, in order to their Information how their Lives and Healths (which are ſo neceſſary, and therefore ought to be dear to them) may be better preſerved. By *H. Chamberlen*, Phyſitian in Ordinary to the Late King *Charles* the Second. price Bound 1 s.

Chriſt's Spirit a Chriſtian's Strength: Or, a plain Diſcovery of the Mighty and Invincible Power that all Believers receive through the Gift of the Spirit. Firſt held forth on two Sermons, on *Act.* 1. 8. and after publiſhed for the Inſtruction and Uſe of thoſe that are Spiritual, *Anno* 1645. by *William Dell*, Miniſter of the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt price Stitch'd 6 d.

Truth's Innocency and Simplicity Shinig, thro' the Converſion, Goſpel-Miniſtry, Labour, Epiſtles of Love, Teſtimonies and Warnings to Profeſſors and Profane (with the long and Patient Sufferings) of that Ancient and Faithful Miniſter and Servant of Jeſus Chriſt, *Thomas Taylor*. price Bound 5 s.

A New Diſcourſe of Trade, where is Recommended ſeveral weighty Points relating to the Companies of *Merchants*, the Act of Navigation, Naturalization of Strangers, and our Woollen Manufactures, the Ballance of Trade, and the Nature of Plantations, and their Conſequences in Relation to the Kingdom, are ſeriouſly Diſcuſſed:

And

And some Proposals for erecting a Court of Merchants for determining Controversies, relating to Maritine Affairs, and for a Law for Transference of Bills of Debts, are humbly Offered. By Sir *Josiah Child.* price Bound 2 s.

A Light shining out of Darkness: Or, Occasional Queries submitted to the Judgment of such as would enquire into the True State of Things in our Times. The whole Work revised by the Author, the Proofs englished and augmented, with sundry Material Discourses, concerning the Ministry, Separation, Inspiration, Scriptures, Humane Learning, Oaths, Tithes, *&c.* With a brief Apology for the *Quakers*, that they are not Inconsistent with Magistracy. The Third Edition. Price Bound 1 s. 6 d.

God's Protecting Providence, Man's Surest Help and Defence, in Times of the greatest Difficulty, and most eminent Danger. Evidenced in the Remarkable Deliverance of *Robert Barrow*, with divers other Persons, from the devouring Waves of the Sea; amongst which they suffered Shipwrack: And also, From the cruel Devouring Jaws of the *Inhumane Canbals of Florida.* Faithfully Related by one of the Persons concerned therein, *Jonathan Dickenson.* Price 8 *d.*

A Collection of the Christian Writings, Labours, Travels and Sufferings, of that Faithful and Approved Minister of Jesus Christ, *Roger Haydock.* To which is added, an Account of his Death and Burial. Price 2 *s.*

The poor Mechanicks Plea, against the Rich Clergys Oppression Shewing, Tithes are no Gospel-Ministers Maintenance. In brief and plain Method, how that Tithes (as now paid) are both inconsistent with the Dispensation of the Law, and Dispensation of the Gospel. Also, how they were brought into the Church, many Hundred Years after Christ, and testified against by several Ancient Christians and Martyrs. With several Sober Reasons against the Payment thereof. By *John Bockett.* Price 3 *d.*

The Universality of the Love of God asserted, in a Testimony to the free Grace in Jesus Christ. By *William Rawlinson.* Price d.

A Plain Account of certain Christian Experiences, Labours, Services and Sufferings, of that Ancient Servant, and Minister of Christ, *Roger Hebden.* Containing both Warning, Consolation and Instruction in Righteousness,